

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, ROWLANDS CASTLE,
HANTS, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XX

JUNE, 1930

No. 120

EDITORIAL

WITH the issue of the present number, THEOLOGY completes the tenth year of its life, and we are glad to say that its circulation during the current year seems to be as high as at any previous time, and, indeed, shows signs of some increase. The task of establishing a new Journal on a self-supporting basis has not been an easy one, though the support of many friends in different capacities has done much to lighten the burden and facilitate the work. Certainly material for such a Journal as this has not been wanting in the thought and life of the Church of the last decade. The echoes of the last Lambeth Conference had scarcely died away before we were in the thick of the Prayer-Book controversy: and from that we have emerged into the issues of Lambeth again. Throughout the period we have endeavoured to represent what we believe to be one of the most fundamental elements in Anglicanism—viz., its synthetic temper, which, while firmly rooted in Catholic faith and devotion, welcomes all that the best scholarship of the day has to contribute to the better knowledge of the truth.

As one looks back over the last ten years, certain books stand out in one's mind as making solid contributions to Christian theology. In the philosophy of theism, von Hügel's two series of *Essays and Addresses* and Professor Taylor's essay in *Essays Catholic and Critical* have been recognized on all sides as works of unusual power, and the same may be said, in the sphere of apologetic, of Dr. Gore's "trilogy" and Dr. Temple's *Christus Veritas*. In dogmatics there have been three notable studies, two of them by Bampton Lecturers: Dr. Rashdall's *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* was a fresh presentation of the Abelardian view; Dr. N. P. Williams in his *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin* vindicated the claim of the Greek tradition as against the African and Western on these subjects; and

Fr. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord* contained a masterly reconstruction of Catholic Christology in the light of the modern philosophy of organism. On the historical side, two issues of paramount importance in regard to Christian origins have been dealt with in a decisive way. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's essay in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, despite its brevity, showed that the Protestant and Modernist views so long dominant in the reading of the Gospels would not stand critical examination; while Dr. N. P. Williams in the same book, and Mr. A. D. Nock in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (ed. Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson), laid the ghost of the Mystery Religions as the explanation of the Christian sacraments. In the sphere of literary criticism, Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels* presented a strong case for a Proto-Luke or first edition of the third Gospel, and substituted a four-document hypothesis for the two-document hypothesis which had held the field for some generations; and, if the Proto-Luke theory cannot yet be regarded as proven, Canon Streeter's elucidation of the connexions of primitive documents with particular churches appears to mark a real step forward in this department. In Eucharistic theology Père de la Taille's monumental work *Mysterium Fidei* has been closely paralleled in Mr. Spens's contributions to *Essays Catholic and Critical* and to this Journal; while Dr. Kirk in a series of books has had the field of technical moral theology almost to himself. The list could be extended, but even as it stands it is a large one, and we do not think that any of the books mentioned could be omitted, if a fair view of the progress of Anglican theology during the last decade were to be gained. Readers of THEOLOGY will, we think, agree that they have been kept *au fait* with the march of events in these pages.

For ourselves we embark on a second decade with mixed feelings. Parochial and other work has increased with time, and, though the routine of editing the Journal runs smoothly, the work involved, which includes a continuous correspondence, is laborious. An editor of a Journal like this, if he is to avoid staleness, ought to be in a position where he has adequate time for theological work of his own, and where he could afford either parochial or secretarial assistance. Stevenson's fable of the gyves has, however, no doubt a moral for us all; and we shall continue to serve our readers, overseas no less than at home, with such powers as we have.

THREE QUESTIONS FROM THE ANGLICAN BISHOPS IN INDIA

1. Is consecration "per saltum" permissible?
2. Is Confirmation necessary before (a) ordination as priest, (b) consecration as bishop?
3. May presbyters take part in the laying on of hands at the consecration of a bishop?

These questions are questions of law: not of spiritual value, or of expediency. The Catholic Church, as a corporate society, must have her laws, which her members are bound to obey. These laws have not all an equal authority. There are laws, such as the law that marriage is indissoluble, which are of Divine Revelation, and therefore cannot be changed even by the whole Church. There are laws and customs accepted by the whole Church, but of merely human origin. And there are laws which belong only to one part of the Church.

The Anglican Churches are committed, in theory and in practice, to the view that any law or custom of merely human origin may be altered by a local part of the Church. The classical instance is the prohibition of marriage after ordination: a law of universal acceptance, which the Anglican Churches have altered. There are plenty of early precedents for this view of the extended powers of national Churches. But it is not now held either by the Roman or by the Orthodox Communion.

In this particular case, we have to discover what the existing law is, as shown by the practice of the various separated divisions of the Church: whether it is a law of a kind which a national Church (*e.g.*, the Anglican Church in India) has the right to alter: and whether, even if it is, the use of the right, in this case, would lead to disastrous consequences.

There is one exception to the principle that a local Church may alter any law or custom which is of merely human origin. It evidently must not alter any law in such a way as to break its fellowship with the rest of the Church. Especially must it refrain from doing anything which will throw doubt on its faith or on the validity of its sacraments. In general, we may say that a law which is universal should not be altered without the gravest necessity. No such necessity can justify a local Church in acting in such a way as to make it impossible for other local Churches to recognize it as part of the Catholic Church.

Having made these preliminary observations, we now turn

to the questions before us. We shall try to discover what the existing practice of the Church is, and whether it has always been what it is now. It will not be necessary, I think, to consider any other precedents than those of the Roman, Orthodox, and Anglican Communion. The Separated Eastern Churches probably agree with the Orthodox on these matters, and the Old Catholic Churches with Rome. The non-episcopal communions possess no bishops and no confirmation (in the Catholic sense), therefore they are outside this discussion.

(1) *Is consecration "per saltum" permissible?*

The late Bishop John Wordsworth collected a large quantity of evidence on this subject, which was published in his book *Ordination Problems*. Only a brief summary of this evidence is possible here.

It does not appear that in the Apostolic Age a man was expected to have been *διάκονος* before being ordained *πρεσβύτερος*. There is no evidence for a graded ascent in the ministry before the age of Cyprian, when it appears to have been the usual custom (Cyprian, *Ep.* lv. 8). But there were exceptions, then and much later. St. Fabian of Rome (236) and St. Gregory Thaumaturgus of Neocæsarea (240) were consecrated as laymen, the diaconate and presbyterate being omitted. The consecration of deacons direct to the episcopate was exceedingly common, especially at Rome, down to the age of Hildebrand. In the fourth century, St. Gregory of Nyssa was consecrated as a layman; so was Nectarius of Constantinople. The great St. Athanasius was consecrated direct from the diaconate. St. Ambrose, on the other hand, was ordained deacon and priest a few days before his consecration. This was the method adopted in the case of Photius I. of Constantinople and many later bishops.

Gradual promotion was required by the tenth Canon of Sardica (343), but the Canons of this Council were not all enforced. However, the requirement of long intervals between the grades of the ministry seems to have been first made by Popes Siricius and Zosimus (fourth to fifth century), and this conclusion is supported by the evidence of the Church Orders, where gradation of orders is first usual about 375-400.

The system of "interstitia" commanded by Pope Siricius (a deacon must remain a deacon so many years before being ordained priest, and the same with a priest before being consecrated bishop) may have been copied from the similar system enforced by Roman Law on *ædiles*, *prætors*, and *consuls*. But it was long before this system was generally practised in the Roman Church. Many Popes, including St. Leo, St. Gregory the Great, and nearly all those of the eighth and ninth centuries, were

consecrated direct from the diaconate. This was one of the Roman practices to which Photius (ninth century) objected.

In the later Middle Ages there are one or two cases in which a priest, who had never been a subdeacon, was ordered to be ordained subdeacon before he might continue to exercise his functions as priest (Letter of Pope Alexander II. to Grimaldus of Coutances, eleventh century). But even Alexander II. did not require the man to be reordained as priest. The phrase "per saltum" was first used in the modern sense by the Council of Soissons (853), of a priest who had never been ordained deacon.

St. Thomas Aquinas regards (*Summa*, III., Suppl. xxxv., 5) the lower order as included in the higher, and this is the common teaching of later Latin theologians and canonists. Consecration "per saltum" of a deacon, or even a layman, to the episcopate is unusual and irregular, but valid: the usual practice (when the "interstitia" were for any reason omitted) was that he should pass rapidly through the lower orders (as in the case of Cardinal Pole, elected Archbishop of Canterbury when only a deacon).

The only Anglican precedent, as far as I know, is the famous consecration of Spottiswood, Archbishop of St. Andrews, and the other Scottish bishops, in 1610. They had had Presbyterian ordination, and had been in legal possession of their sees for some years.

Bishop Andrewes protested that they ought first to be ordained deacons and priests. Archbishop Bancroft's reply is differently stated by Spottiswood himself and by Heylin. According to Spottiswood, Bancroft said that in case of necessity, Presbyterian ordination was sufficient: according to Heylin, who wrote in 1670, Bancroft claimed that ordination "per saltum" was permissible. In any case, Andrewes was convinced, and took part in the consecration.

The later consecration of Sharp and Leighton, in similar circumstances, was preceded by their ordination to the lower orders. Sharp protested, but he was told that the case was different from that of Spottiswood. In 1610 the Scottish Church had not deliberately rejected episcopacy: in 1660 it had.

We may conclude that ordination and consecration "per saltum" have frequently taken place in the history of the Church, and therefore cannot be regarded by any part of the Church as invalid. Bishop Wordsworth adds the following four observations:

(i.) The Anglican Communion has the right to dispense from rules of discipline not touching the four essentials, matter, form, minister, and intention. (Should he not have added, status of recipient? An unbaptized man cannot be ordained: nor can a woman.)

(ii.) According to Pope Gelasius, such rules may be dispensed with in case of necessity, such as war, and proposed schemes of union are such a necessity.

(iii.) The Apostolic Canon permits the consecration "per saltum" of men of proved spiritual gifts.

(iv.) The advantage of such consecration is that it does not raise the question of the previous status of Presbyterian ministers.

To this I would add one word of caution. The word "bishop" is now equivocal. There are Lutheran bishops in Denmark and other countries, "Reformed" (i.e., Presbyterian) bishops in Hungary, Methodist bishops in America. But none of these are bishops in the sense in which the Catholic Church uses that term. They do not claim "sacerdotium"; they do not regard themselves as a separate order, or as successors of the Apostles. In any consecration of bishops "per saltum," care must be taken to make clear that they are being made bishops in the Catholic sense: that all the powers, sacerdotal and other, possessed by any Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Armenian, Jacobite, Assyrian, Old Catholic, or Anglican bishop, are being conferred upon them. To confer "episcopacy" without defining it, at any rate to the extent of saying that it is the same as what all the historic Episcopal Churches mean by episcopacy, is simply to perform a consecration which is doubtful, and therefore invalid.

How, in the future, will the Anglican Churches be able to say, "We have the same apostolic ministry as Rome, Constantinople, Utrecht, and Etchmiadzin," if one Church in communion with Canterbury interrupts with, "Oh, no, our bishops are only the same kind of bishops as those of the American Methodists"?

2. *Is Confirmation necessary before ordination or consecration?*

Confirmation is not merely a ceremony by which the young are admitted to full membership, including the privilege of communion. It is a special gift of the Holy Ghost, bestowed by means of the laying on of hands (or of chrism), distinct from baptism on the one hand, and ordination on the other. It is the second part of the initiatory rite of the Church, closely connected with Baptism, with which it was always administered in early times, as it still is in the Eastern Churches. It is an apostolic ordinance, which was certainly regarded by St. Peter and St. John as necessary, or they would not have undertaken the dangerous journey to Samaria (a city in which Jews have never been popular) in order to administer it.

The question may be put in this way: A clergyman (of whatever order) is found not to have been confirmed; is his ordination rendered invalid by the lack of confirmation (as it undoubtedly would be if he had not been baptized)? There are three possible answers to this question:

(a) Lack of confirmation renders the ordination invalid, and he must be confirmed and ordained properly.

(b) His ordination stands, but as he has never been confirmed, he must be confirmed now.

(c) The gift of ordination includes that of confirmation, therefore he is to be regarded as confirmed.

There seems to be no authority for the first view. Both in medieval and post-medieval days, many persons must have missed confirmation. If any such persons were ordained, no one has ever suggested that their ordinations were invalid. It is certain that Archbishop Spottiswood and his colleagues were not confirmed: for confirmation was not reintroduced into Scotland until the "Five Articles of Perth" were passed by the General Assembly in 1618, eight years after the consecration of these bishops. But no one has ever suggested that their consecration was invalid on this ground.

Neither have I found any authority for the second view.* The ordinary teaching of Latin theology appears to be that ordination includes confirmation (F. J. Hall, *Dogmatic Theology*, vol. viii., p. 338, with refs.). In the Eastern Churches the problem can hardly arise, because Baptism and confirmation are always administered together, and every baptized person is also confirmed.

But the question before us refers to the future rather than to the past. The case supposed is not that of a bishop, priest, or deacon, who has never been confirmed, but that of a candidate for ordination, or consecration, who has never been confirmed because he has been brought up in a religious society which does not practise confirmation.

This is an entirely different case, and it is one which occurs frequently in our theological colleges. I have met with it myself. The duty of a man in this position is clearly to be confirmed before his ordination. There is no doubt about his position. He does not claim to have been confirmed already. (The rite called confirmation in the Lutheran (including the Swedish) and some of the Reformed Churches (*e.g.*, the Dutch) is not what we mean by confirmation. There is no laying on of hands, and no claim to be the means of bestowing the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Swedish confirmation is a public oral examination in the Faith, preceded by forty hours (not, of course, consecutive!) of instruction by the priest: an admirable custom from which we may well learn much, but quite different from confirmation as understood among ourselves).

* There is a curious and perhaps unique case among the Non-Jurors, mentioned by Canon Ollard. Bishop Robert Gordon, who had been consecrated in 1741, had doubts about his own confirmation, and in 1769 had himself confirmed by the Bishop of Ross.

The only conceivable reason why a man in this position should be unwilling to be confirmed is that he does not believe in confirmation. But if he does not believe in confirmation, he is not fit to be ordained: not only because confirmation is an apostolic ordinance, which Holy Scripture shows to be a necessary part of the Christian life, and therefore a Church without confirmation is gravely defective, but also because it will be his duty, if a priest, to prepare children for confirmation; if a bishop, to administer it. How can he perform either of these duties, if he himself has refused to be confirmed?

Moreover, a Church which admits to Holy Orders men who have not only not been confirmed, but have refused to be confirmed, is throwing the gravest doubts on its own attitude towards confirmation. Such action on the part of a Church implies that it believes that confirmation is merely optional: that it does not much matter whether a man is confirmed or not. Such a belief is contrary to the teaching of the New Testament and of all the ancient Churches, including the Anglican: we should, I think, be justified in describing it as heretical, and in refusing to communicate with any Church which held it: for it is an insult to God the Holy Ghost to accept His gifts and yet to think them of no great importance.

Then what about the precedent of 1610?

In normal conditions, Spottiswood and his colleagues certainly ought to have been confirmed. But the conditions were anything but normal. King James was determined, for political reasons, to reintroduce episcopacy into Scotland. The Scottish Reformation had been Calvinistic: even the Church of England was at that time led by men whose doctrine (though not their views of Church government) was for the most part Calvinistic and whose hold on the sacramental system was weak. Calvin, like Luther before him, rejected confirmation as a sacramental gift. It would have been very imprudent for the King to insist on confirmation: it was episcopacy, not the restoration of the Catholic sacramental system, that was his object, and the consecration was carried out by his command: there was no request for it from Scotland. Eight years later, confirmation was one of the Five Articles carried with difficulty through the Assembly of Perth: but it was very little used in Scotland, even then.

The whole story of the "first episcopate" in Scotland shows that it was an attempt to induce a nation, which was Calvinistic by conviction, to accept an ecclesiastical system in which it did not believe. This attempt ended in complete failure, and the "second episcopate" would have been a failure too but for the staunchness of the Non-Jurors. It was not possible to

make so intelligent and so determined a people as the Scots change their religion against their will. I doubt if the attempt would ever have been made, but for the hatred felt by the Stewarts for the democratic system of Presbyterianism. A lasting union cannot be brought about in this way. If people are convinced that confirmation is a great gift of God which is being offered to them, they will accept it. If they are not convinced of this, schemes of ecclesiastical union with them are premature. The Scottish experiments of the seventeenth century were attempts, not to persuade the Scots to accept sacramental doctrine, but to force them to accept episcopal government. They are not sound precedents, and it is not surprising that they failed.

3. *May Presbyters take part in the laying on of hands at the consecration of a bishop?*

The word "presbyter" is even more equivocal than the word "bishop." It has been applied to two quite different kinds of ministers, with the result of confusing almost hopelessly the question of ordination in its relation to unity.

(a) In the Catholic system the presbyter or priest is a member of the second order of the ministry, of which the "differentia" (that which makes it what it is) is the possession of three functions, all of which properly belong to the bishop, but are entrusted to the priest as his representative: the leadership of the faithful in the offering of the Holy Eucharist, the absolution of sinners, and the giving of the blessing. These functions, with the grace appropriate to their exercise, are only bestowed by the laying on of hands by a bishop, which is an "efficacious sign" or sacrament by which both grace and authority are conveyed.

(b) In the Presbyterian system there are two kinds of presbyters: the preaching presbyter or minister, and the ruling presbyter or elder. Both are ordained by laying on of hands (it is a mistake to suppose that the Presbyterian elder is a layman, though he carries on his ordinary business): both are entrusted with the administration of the sacraments and of Church discipline: both sit, on equal terms (and they alone), in all the courts and synods of the Presbyterian Churches. The difference between them is that the minister has authority to preach (the expression invariably used in the Westminster Confession is "preaching presbyter") and the elder has not. The ministry is a prophetic, not a sacerdotal, ministry: an office, not an order (see article "Presbyterianism" in *Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*). Ordination is in no sense a sacrament: it does not convey grace, but only authority; it is the ratification by the Church of the call which the presbyter

has already received, internally from God the Holy Ghost, and externally from the congregation (*Faith and Order*, pp. 264, 271, which gives the view of the South Indian United Church). It is true that some Presbyterians, such as the late Dr. James Cooper, have claimed for their ministry sacerdotal functions, but there is no support for this view in the Presbyterian formularies, and it is clear that the Scottish Reformers, following Calvin, intended, not to continue the pre-Reformation ministry (which they regarded as wholly corrupt), but to establish a new ministry on what they believed to be the teaching of Holy Scripture.

The important difference between these two systems is not a difference of government. One can imagine a Church governed exactly on the Presbyterian model, in which every minister was a bishop, and every elder a voluntary priest, of the kind desired by Mr. Roland Allen, and which would closely resemble the North African Church as it was in the third century. But such a Church would be fundamentally different from the present Presbyterian Churches, because its ministry would be sacerdotal, as well as prophetic. This distinction, blurred as it has been by equivocal terms and by the disputed character of the Anglican ministry, is really quite obvious. Everybody knows that a Presbyterian minister is not the same kind of person, and is not expected to do the same kind of things, as a Roman Catholic (Orthodox, Armenian, etc.) priest. There were other differences between the ministry of, say, the Curé d'Ars and Dr. Chalmers, besides the fact that one was, and the other was not, ordained by a bishop!

And what is true of the Presbyterians is at least equally true of the Lutherans (always excepting the Church of Sweden), the Methodists, and the Congregationalists, though the method of government and the theory of ordination may be somewhat different. These ministries are prophetic, not sacerdotal: ordination is valued as a matter of Church order, but it is in no sense sacramental: no continuity is necessary, even the laying on of hands is not absolutely indispensable.

It has been necessary to draw this distinction, for otherwise the question, to which we now turn, would not be clear.

The consecration of a bishop can only be performed by bishops, because they alone have the authority of the Church to consecrate. There may have been cases in which priests joined with the bishop (when, for some special reason, there was only one consecrator instead of three) in laying their hands on the head of the man consecrated; but if so, it was a mere form, signifying the consent of the clergy: it had no importance or sacramental effect.

But the question is whether presbyters in sense (b) may take part in the consecration of a bishop. What is the effect intended? They cannot be the means of conveying the grace of orders, or episcopal authority, for they have not been authorized to ordain to the sacerdotal, but only to the prophetic ministry. All that they can do by laying on hands is to ratify, in the name of their society, the prophetic gift which they believe the bishop to have received. But this should be done at a different time from the consecration. The laying on of hands by two sets of people, at the same moment, but with different intentions, can have no result but confusion.

But it may be said, "You are assuming that the consecration conveys the sacerdotal ministry; but this is just what is not asserted: the United Church is not to be asked to accept any particular theory of episcopacy."

It is of course tenable, and it is held by many Anglicans as individuals, that the sacerdotal claims of the Catholic ministry are false, and that the Anglican ministry, like the Presbyterian, is simply a prophetic ministry. (No one denies that it *is* a prophetic ministry: the disputed point is, whether it is *also* a sacerdotal ministry.) But it is impossible for any Anglican Church formally to assert this view: for to do so would be to break up the Anglican Communion. Those who believe in the necessity of a sacerdotal ministry would say that the ordinations of a Church which made such a declaration were invalid for want of intention: the Reformed Episcopal Church, whose ordinations the Lambeth Conference of 1920 refused to recognize, is a case in point.

Even if there is any uncertainty about the character of the ordination, that is enough to make it invalid: for validity means compliance with the external conditions which are required for security. The united Church in South India must state clearly and explicitly that the new bishops are to be made bishops in the same sense in which all Anglican bishops, and indeed all Roman, Orthodox, Old Catholic, Armenian, Jacobite, and Assyrian bishops, are made bishops. Unless it does, the episcopacy which it confers will not be the "historic episcopate." If there is any doubt about its intention to consecrate bishops in this sense, the consecrations will be invalid. For only that which is certain is valid: uncertainty is the same as invalidity. According to Bishop John Wordsworth, "intention" is one of the four conditions of a valid ordination or consecration, with which the Anglican Communion has no right to meddle.

Therefore it is, strictly speaking, impossible to make a man a bishop without any theory of what episcopacy is. The consecrators must at least have the clear intention of doing what the

Church does : not only what the Anglican Communion does, but what the whole Church does. They may have unusual views as to what it is that the Church does when a bishop is consecrated, but they must intend to do it, whatever it may be: and it is for the Church as a whole to say what it is, not for a particular national Church or group of bishops. If they have no such intention, or even if their intention is doubtful, the consecration will be invalid, even though there may be no question about the matter, form, or minister.

We Anglicans maintain that the intention of our Reformers to do what the Church does is quite certain, if only from these two proofs: the explicit statement of the intention to continue the three Orders, in the Preface to the Ordinal, and the fact that we have always accepted Roman priests in their Orders, but never Presbyterian ministers or other members of "prophetic" ministries. Our contention is supported by the unbiassed opinion of the Eastern and Old Catholic Churches, and is only repudiated by Rome, for reasons which we understand too well to attach any importance to them.

Archbishops Temple and Maclagan, in their famous answer to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, which was drawn up by Bishops Creighton, Stubbs, and Wordsworth, used the following words:

"Our Holy Orders are identical with those of the whole Catholic Church. They are, in origin, continuity, matter, form, intention, and all that belongs to them, identical accordingly with those of the Church of Rome except in the one modern point of subjection to the Pope, on which point at the Reformation we deliberately resumed our ancient concurrence with the whole Catholic world besides."

Unless the Anglican Church in India is going to stand by this declaration, and to secure that all consecrations and ordinations are explicitly and undoubtedly in accordance with its principles, she has no justification for insisting upon episcopacy in any form.

C. B. Moss.

THE MEANING OF THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

IN the "Lambeth Quadrilateral," formulated by the Lambeth Conference of 1888, the fourth of the heads was: "The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church" (*Five Lambeth Conferences*, S.P.C.K., 1920, p. 122).

The three other heads were: (1) Holy Scripture; (2) The Nicene Creed; (3) The two Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. The words are plain, and the four heads definite and fundamental, but it may be assumed that the four points, although stated separately, yet form a coherent whole. I am mainly concerned here with the fourth, quoted above.

Before the Conference, a Committee of the Lower House of the Southern Convocation had (1870) considered Unity and Reunion: their report disapproved of making any "alteration of our existing formularies of faith and worship," although they did not deny that "concessions might be admitted hereafter." They suggested that all religious bodies should be asked to pray for unity, appropriately enough on the anniversary of the Queen's accession. The Northern Convocation also considered the matter. Nor were our daughter Churches behind-hand. The General Synod of Australia and Tasmania (1886) recorded their solemn sense of the evils of division and prayed the coming Lambeth Conference to consider what steps could be taken. The Diocesan Synod of Montreal did the same: so, too, did the Provincial Synod of Rupertsland and the General Synod of New Zealand. In the same year the Canadian Synod formed a joint committee to confer with other bodies. The General Convention of the American Episcopal Church at the same date went into the discussion even more deeply, and the wording of the Fourth Head of the Quadrilateral is copied from their conclusions, so that the Lambeth Conference of 1888 found its way prepared and its grave discussions looked for. Since then our Church has never lost sight of this most important matter. But, in the words of the American Church, it was not wished "to absorb other communities but to co-operate with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to discountenance schism and to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ." The spirit of this American declaration is admirable, but it may be a little difficult to combine precisely co-operation, the discountenance of schism, and the apparent continued evidence of separate bodies. And it may be noted that the Conference, which fully considered the position of Eastern Churches, of the Scandinavian Churches, of the old Catholics, and the *Unitas Fratrum*, held it useless to consider reunion with their Roman brethren, since no proposals for reunion with them would have any chance of success except on the basis of our complete submission to Roman claims.

Reunion was again considered at the Conference of 1897. A growth of friendliness with the Eastern Churches could happily be noted. But this was not the case with the Roman Church, for Leo XIII. had by then given his decision on Anglican

Orders,* and the Conference rightly saw the seeming impossibility of any unity which would mean "the recognition of the papal supremacy as of divine right." The Quadrilateral was repeated, and some fresh matter added about various bodies.

At the Conference of 1908 there was a further consideration of reunion, and emphasis was laid upon "the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation." "In all partial projects of reunion and intercommunion the final attainment of the divine purpose" was to be "kept in view" as "the object," and care was to "be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it." These wise words of caution seem to be due to the same fear that was expressed by Hort, when he was asked to join the Protestant Alliance. He wished to cultivate "sympathy with foreign Protestant bodies as well as the Greek and unreformed Latin Churches." "But" (he said), "it is not easy to take part in public proceedings for the one without being in antagonism to the others; and any surrender of our Catholic position would be a fatal mistake."

More was said about reunion at the Conference of 1920, and it was followed, as we all remember, by much public discussion and interest (*Conference of Bishops*, and *The Encyclical Letter*, S.P.C.K., 1920, p. 11 seq.): "Men in all communions began to think of the reunion of Christendom, not as a laudable ambition or a beautiful dream, but as an imperative necessity. Proposals and counter-proposals were made, some old, some new. Mutual recognition, organic union, federation, absorption, submission—these phrases indicate the variety of the programmes put forward." Some proposals came from the mission field, with the urgent work of evangelization and the problem of national Churches. And, as a result of the war, "the ancient Churches of the East drew nearer to us than ever before." "The great wind" was blowing over the whole earth. An unusually large Committee discussed, and felt, what is a common experience in councils and synods, the power of the Holy Spirit impressing a hallowed unity. The well-known "Appeal to all Christian people" expressed all this, and it met with wide approval.

The appeal did not start with a definition of the measure of uniformity which was essential. It was rightly felt that the

* The answer of the English Archbishops is given, along with the Bull *Apostolicae Curæ*, in Canon T. A. Lacey's *Roman Diary* (Longmans, 1910), p. 354 and p. 341. An English translation was also published. The late Dr. H. B. Swete's *Lecture On the Bull Apostolicae Curæ* is a model of treatment (Macmillan and Bowes, Cambridge, 1896). See also *The Bull Apostolicae Curæ* and the *Edwardian Ordinal* by F. W. Puller (Church Historical Society, S.P.C.K., No. 16).

real truths embodied in the differences that have arisen were essentials to the larger coherent Church. Therefore there was no desire to belittle what is distinctive to ourselves, but to hold it as a precious trust for the common good, and this naturally meant an appeal to the history of the past, for others and for ourselves.

The appeal urged that visible unity involved: (1) the Holy Scriptures as a record of revelation, and the Nicene Creed as a sufficient statement of the faith; (2) the divinely instituted sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Holy Communion as expressions of the corporate life; and (3) "a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."

And in a paragraph, very weighty and well expressed (p. 28), the bishops urged "a reasonable claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry." There was no wish to question the spiritual reality of other and non-Episcopal ministries, but history and experience seemed to justify the claim made for Episcopacy.

It may seem an impertinence to draw attention to the admirable spirit and wording of the appeal, but it is well to do so if only to emphasize the authority, spiritual as well as official, belonging to the statement.

The leaders of the Church, while wishing to do their utmost for the cause of unity and hopeful of a good result, had no expectation of immediate results. But some others were less wise or more impulsive, and seemed to think that the work was largely done: they did not recognize, as the bishops did, that we had in the appeal an ideal which could only be realized in many years. There was too much impatience in many members of our Church.

It is difficult to estimate the exact effect of the appeal upon other bodies. Its truly Christian spirit was everywhere approved, and much consideration was given to it. But some disappointment was felt, on the whole perhaps somewhat unreasonably, that few schemes or definite steps for reunion were suggested by representative assemblies of these bodies. As for Episcopacy the force of its claims was mostly admitted. Little hostility was expressed towards it. But for the most part it became clear that practically the separate bodies preferred to remain as they were: both the securing of greater unity among Presbyterians in Scotland, and a growing unity among non-Episcopal or "Free" Churches in England, naturally made them less desirous of what to many among their members seemed to be "absorption" or "submission." There was

an intelligible wish not to appear as belittling their own ministries or condemning their past. But that beneath all this there was an increase of Christian concord and a truer perception of the position of the English Church hardly admits of doubt.

But, as it seems to me unfortunately, many English clergymen and even one or two bishops went beyond what the Conference had said. There was a great deal of "interchange of pulpits," for the most part without Episcopal leave beforehand, and in many cases, notably at a few theological Halls, "intercommunion" has been not only advocated but practised. This is a matter of discipline as well as of principle which the Lambeth Conference had dealt with (1920, see *Resolutions*, etc., as before, p. 30). It laid down: (1) that a Bishop was "justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers not episcopally ordained who were working towards union" to preach in churches of his diocese: also to his clergy to preach in the churches of such ministers; (2) that it would not question the action of a Bishop "who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, should" countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion unconfirmed communicants of the non-Episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme. The Conference gave "general approval" to the suggestions of the sub-committee on reunion about the status and work of ministers remaining without Episcopal ordination after union. This sub-committee on reunion with non-Episcopal Churches had reported (p. 142), that "no priest has canonical authority to refuse communion to any baptized person" unless excommunicated or a cause of scandal. Nothing they said was, they stated, intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to baptized persons seeking admission under conditions justifying it in the Episcopal opinion. The status of ministers remaining after union without Episcopal ordination was considered: it was reported that they could be admitted to Synods and Councils, that they should not be allowed to administer the Holy Communion to congregations with an Episcopal minister, but might preach or conduct services for them if licensed by the Bishop. The Conference's report, however, stated that it could not approve "general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits," and (basing themselves on the Preface to the Ordinal) that it could not approve celebrations of Holy Communion for Anglicans by ministers not episcopally ordained, and that by the general rule of the Church Anglicans should receive the Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church or of Churches in communion with it.

The Resolutions and Reports seem to contemplate a more advanced state of negotiations or proceeding than any reached as yet; although cautious and conservative in most ways, they seem to pay less regard to Confirmation than many theologians would think desirable, or parochial experience suggests.

In connection with these matters the *Letter* of Lord Davidson, then Archbishop of Canterbury, on the "Kikiyu" controversy may be referred to (S.P.C.K., 1915). A clear account of the whole matter is to be found in Canon Maynard Smith's *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar* (S.P.C.K., 1925, chap. viii.). In that episode the questions of (1) federation: (2) admission to Anglican pulpits of ministers not episcopally ordained; (3) admission to Holy Communion of baptized Christians not episcopally confirmed; (4) the sanction of our members receiving the Holy Communion from ministers not episcopally ordained, were all raised. The Archbishop referred the whole matter to the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference, and received its report (see the Archbishop's pamphlet, Appendix B, p. 42), but took the full responsibility of the decision upon himself. The nature of the federation proposed was not very clear, and it could not be regarded as reunion. But in the Archbishop's view a Diocesan Bishop could, if circumstances called for it, sanction the admission to Holy Communion in (3). Such admission should presuppose the first three heads of the Quadrilateral, and each case should be considered on its merits. The question under (4) was raised academically rather than practically. The matter might seem raised in the mission field, but any approval of the reciprocal admission could not be confined to those limits. But the committee (p. 46) "could not regard any such arrangements as consistent with the principles of the Church of England," and for clear support they were able to refer to the Lambeth Conference of 1908. As to (2) the committee (p. 44) saw no essential difficulty if the Bishop invited a minister of another body, or authorized the invitation, being satisfied of a proper qualification. About "open communions" the committee reported that "to encourage habitual action of the kind must be held to be inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England" (p. 47). Both the Archbishop and the committee laid stress upon the impossibility of any part of our Church taking action of its own without a proper regard to the unity of the whole Communion. Looking at all our material, we have a clear account of the views of the Conference and of bodies representing it. The special difficulties of the mission field were carefully considered: charity was borne in mind, but the whole result was to maintain what has been the position of the Church of England. We should notice the responsibility

laid upon the Bishop: it is in his discretion, not in that of individual priests, to relax or depart from the rules which have hitherto governed the Church. It can hardly be said that of late years in England this clear distinction has always been observed, and this, like any infringement of the Church's law, is not merely to be regretted, but to be held absolutely lawless and wrong.

It has been asked what is the exact meaning of the Historic Episcopate, a favourite term with Lightfoot, and used in the Quadrilateral. Happily we have a definition in Bishop Stubbs' account of the 1888 Conference (*Visitation Charges*, edited after his death by Canon E. E. Holmes, Longman, 1907).

There we have a vivid description of the meeting and of the spirit of the discussion, which is indeed plain to see in the official account. There was no bitterness, no judgment of others: there was no attempt, such as was common in earlier centuries, to formulate new articles of belief or rules of order or rites of worship. The assembled bishops, with a full sense of responsibility, only tried to hold fast what they had received, to realize what they had. And in doing this they followed the best examples of earlier days.

Of the Quadrilateral he says (p. 130): "It appears to me that the articles of basis constitute the one side of a concordat which states the very minimum of what the Church of England could advance, without a practical renunciation of her own vital position. The historic Episcopate, not merely as a method of Church government—in which sense it could hardly be called historic—but as a distinct, substantive and historical transmission of the commission of the Apostles, in and by which our Lord formed His disciples through all generations into a distinctly organized body or Church—the historic Episcopate is of the very essence of the Church of England, and could not be suffered to be called in question by any body or individual desirous to be incorporated in our Communion. And the assertion of such a principle involves either* the admission to Holy Orders of all Presbyterian or otherwise ordained ministers who are desirous of being united to us, before we could recognize their position or join their services with ours. To make this demand appears to me somewhat unreasonable: the very essence of Presbyterianism is presbytery, and the essence of historical Presbyterianism is the negation of historic Episcopacy." Stubbs was not only one of the greatest medieval historians, with great power of tracing the growth of institutions and a vivid sympathy for understanding characters, but also, as he proved in his later

* There seems to be some confusion or slip in the wording here. I think the word "either" should follow "Holy Orders." But the sense is clear.

works, great command of Reformation and post-Reformation history also.

Dr. Stubbs went on: "To expect reunion on a basis which means with one of the two parties a renunciation of its essential principle, seems, I say, unreasonable and impracticable. In saying this, I must not be understood as meaning more than I say. There are Presbyterian Churches with a historical succession of great authority and completeness. In affirming our historical Episcopate I am throwing no doubt either on their constitutional consistency or on their spiritual work. God has many ways of doing His work, and because I maintain that we have one of His ways in our Church, I am not to be said to maintain that that which is in use, in Scotland we will say, is not of His ways, or that other ministrations than ours are dead and useless." He then passed on to consider in much the same way the case of the Baptists.

But it might seem, Dr. Stubbs feared, that in saying all this he was objecting to reunion or, at any rate, discouraging those who looked and worked for it. This was far from the truth. Lack of unity he held (as we all do) to be the obstacle to the ultimate victory of Christ's Church, and the fulfilment of His prayer for its unity should be our aim, to be reached by any sacrifice short of the sacrifice of truth. In due time if we went our destined way in faith and hope, in its due time the unity would come. But it would not come by mutual sacrifices of reality and unity. It would not be "secured by illusory projects of comprehension." To help us along our proper path, he pointed out the usefulness of co-operation in all kinds of social work, and the need of trying to understand each other better, both in our common beliefs and distinctive tenets.

So the great Bishop, typical in his English common-sense and nearly unequalled in his knowledge of history, impressed upon us the need of patience. So, too, our leaders told us in their appeal to all Christian people. But in the glow of the first enthusiasm many looked for a speedy response, and expected the result of at least half a century's work to be forestalled in two or three years. And now, if I judge rightly, a feeling of disappointment has taken the place of too eager hope, and therefore "illusory projects of comprehension" are urged upon us once more.

J. P. WHITNEY.

WILLIAM SOMERTON, PRIOR OF BYNHAM

HUGH DE EVERSDON, who became Abbot of the famous Abbey of St. Alban's in 1308, said to the monks shortly after his election, "I know, my brothers, that you might have chosen a shrewder and more learned man as your head, but you could not have found anyone in your number more sociably inclined." Eversdon's knowledge of English and French was all that could be desired, but he "feared nothing more than the Latin tongue, with which he was imperfectly acquainted."

The monastery had hoped that the Proctors who announced Eversdon's election to the Abbey would have been able to induce Pope Clement V. to dispense with his presence for his Confirmation. Yet though the Proctors "incurred horrible expense in various presents," the Pope was obdurate. He must see the face of an elect of whom the King, the Queen, and others in high position, had written in such glowing terms, and could take no denial. The Court of Clement at Avignon was notorious alike for its profusion and its exactions, and the Pontiff's desire to wring still more money from the Abbey probably more than equalled his wish to see the newly appointed Abbot. As Clement insisted on seeing him, Eversdon was compelled to go to Avignon, and even to face some little inquiry into his knowledge of Latin. True, however, to the character which he had given of himself, he won his way to the hearts of the Cardinals, who were his examiners, and induced them to deal gently with him. His election was in due course confirmed by Clement, and the Abbot, anxious to leave a good impression behind him, was lavish in his presents to the Pope, the Cardinals, and all the officials of the Curia, who declared with one accord that they had rarely met with a man so generous and so appreciative.

The Abbot's journey to the Curia, and his lavish presents there, involved an outlay of a thousand pounds—equal, probably, to thirty thousand pounds, if expressed in modern values. He had, in addition, paid the papal tax, known as the first-fruits of a year's income of the Abbacy. Such expenses should, in themselves, have been a call to economy when he returned to England. The Abbot's sociable and free-handed manners made this impossible. He was the intimate friend of King Edward II., and the friendship of princes is proverbially costly. He was fond of the society of ladies, and as he was tall, handsome, and eminently well-bred, the pleasure was doubtless reciprocated. Yet we are assured that his princely way of entertaining them

constituted a serious drain upon his resources. He gave away annuities, and thus encroached on the income of the Abbey. Building operations were in constant progress, the cost of which was only partially met by the donations of the King and others. From these and other causes the Abbot found himself before long with a depleted exchequer and, like the Steward in the Gospel, was compelled to look round for fresh resources. He was not long in deciding to extract more than had been customary from the Cells of the Abbey.

These Cells were considerable priories subject to the jurisdiction and visitation of the Abbot, and liable to be called upon by him for contributions to his necessities. Several of the Cells lay at long distances from St. Alban's—indeed, the Abbey possessed them as far away as the Counties of Northumberland, Lincolnshire, and Norfolk. The Abbot knew very well that some of the Priors would be sure either to find excuses for not paying his demands, or would ignore them altogether. Mere demands, he felt, would bring in nothing. He decided, therefore, to threaten defaulters with a long personal visit from himself and his retinue, a proceeding which would involve them in immense expense of the maintenance of himself, his chaplains, attendants, servants, and all their horses. Abbot Hugh convinced himself that the Priors would infinitely prefer payment of his requirements to having their homes turned into hostels where the landlords would board and lodge their guests and receive in return nothing but words. At the same time, he was quite ready, if necessary, to translate his threats into action.

There can be no question that he met his match in the Prior of Bynham in Norfolk. This Prior, who was called William of Somerton, is described as a "great waster of money," and, as such, had certainly nothing to spare for the Abbot. Somerton had fallen into the unscrupulous hands of a brother of the mendicant orders, who had promised him fabulous wealth by means of alchemy. Success, said the friar, was conditional only on payment of the expenses of the experiments, and what was that compared with the gold which would soon be gathered in? Somerton paid a large sum, which quickly melted away. The friar urged that Rome was not built in a day, and that more time and more money were needed ere the great secret was revealed. Again Somerton listened and continued to listen, again paid and continued to pay, until the friar had relieved him of most of his money. Somerton had often been warned against the machinations of the friar, but difficulty in finding any more property to mortgage, or any more woods to cut down, were the only monitions which he

heeded. He was now in much the same position as Moses Primrose after the fair, and had not even a gross of green spectacles to show for his money. As for the friar, he left the bird which he had plucked, passed on his way, and we hear of him no more.

The Abbot of St. Alban's, unable to obtain more money from Somerton, resolved to make the long journey into Norfolk, and with a goodly company, to live at the expense of Bynham Priory. Somerton was strongly supported by the monks; he also possessed influential friends in neighbouring feudal lords, the chief of whom was Robert Walkefare. Moreover, he was strengthened by the moral support of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, grandson of Henry III., and a powerful opponent of Edward II. The Earl was the idol of the people, by whom he was venerated with superstitious reverence after he had been beheaded at Pontefract.

As a result of the support which Somerton received, the Abbot, on his arrival at Bynham, found himself confronted with an organized resistance against which he and his followers were powerless. Walkefare and other landowners assisted Somerton, and the monks had, in fact, turned the Priory into a castellated fortress, into which it was impossible for an enemy to enter. The Abbot, in consequence, was forced to return home, foiled and humiliated, and became for some time the butt of ridicule and contempt. Yet he was not the man to sit down quietly after such a repulse. He turned over the matter, and a new expedient quickly presented itself.

The Abbot, as already has been stated, was on intimate terms with Edward II. "Surely," he thought, "if I tell him the whole truth, the King will not suffer me, the Abbot of St. Alban's and one of his dearest friends, to be insulted, reviled, and robbed of my rights and privileges." He lost no time in laying his plaint before Edward and asking for his assistance. His prayer was met by a writ to the Sheriff of Norfolk enjoining the dispersal of Walkefare's force from Bynham under threat of punishment for contempt of the Crown. The men under arms at once quitted the Priory. The rebellious monks were brought to St. Alban's and at first confined in the Abbot's gaol there. They were afterwards attached to the Abbey, but in all solemn processions walked in front bound in fetters. Somerton himself fled to the Roman Court at Avignon. There he soon gave proof of his versatile genius and plausible address, which he turned to good account. English nobles were constant visitors at the Court, and from them Somerton, by his intercessions, obtained sympathy and help. Moreover, as the Abbot was a friend of the King, he became by that very fact

the enemy of the party in opposition to him. To this cause, perhaps, as much as to his exertions, we may attribute the aid given by the Earl of Hereford to Somerton. Hereford, like the Earl of Lancaster, was one of Edward's enemies, and was afterwards slain at the battle of Borobridge. An appeal to the Pontiff made by monks at Bynham before they were taken to St. Alban's Abbey, requesting their protection by the Archbishop of Canterbury against the Abbot, was one of the many documents which flooded the Curia in connection with Somerton.

The Abbot, on his part, was not idle. As the headship of the Priory was vacant by the flight and apostasy of Somerton, a new Prior was appointed. The Abbot and the new Prior then acted in concert to bring about the outlawry of Somerton. Their efforts were successful, and he became "a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth." Thus outlawed and supplanted in the Priory, Somerton, who seems to have taken with him to Avignon a considerable sum of money derived from the sale of jewels and ornaments belonging to the convent, spent it freely in bribing the Cardinals to obtain the favourable consideration of his case by the Pope. He knew, we are told, that the Cardinals thirsted for money. To gifts, so potent a charm at the Curia, he added promises and entreaties, and no doubt represented in the blackest colours the tyranny and oppression of Abbot Hugh. His "suggestions" or complaint against the Abbot were at last brought under the Pontifical eye. They declared that the Abbot had made extortionate demands in excess of his powers. He had squandered on himself the money thus extracted "to the notorious impoverishment of the Priory of Bynham." Unless he were firmly dealt with, almsgiving and hospitality would utterly cease at the Abbey.

By this time Clement V. had passed away, no doubt to the regret of the mob of time-servers and sycophants who infested his Court. The reigning Pope was now John XXII., noted for his honest efforts to heal the serious intestine disputes in England which culminated in the death of Edward II. The Pope, influenced by the gravity of the charges, the many influential appeals which had been made to him and probably advised by the Cardinals, ordered the personal appearance of the Abbot at Avignon, there to answer the case that had been presented against him. The Abbot was sorely puzzled on receiving the papal command. Should he disobey it, he would incur the displeasure of the Pope and the contempt of his Order and of his countrymen, who would declare that he was too cowardly to go. If, on the other hand, he went, he knew that a long, dangerous, and expensive journey lay before him, and that there was no certainty of the view which the Pope might take of the

quarrel between himself and Somerton. With a faint hope lurking in his heart that insurmountable obstacles might arise to prevent his journey, the Abbot resolved on the bolder course. Nothing occurred to give any excuse for the revision of his resolution. The day of departure arrived, and on April 1, 1319, the Abbot, accompanied by an imposing retinue of "clerks," men-at-arms, and servants, left his Abbey for London. As he and his attendants were all mounted, and would take their horses with them to France, some idea may be formed of the cost of the excursion. Extravagant as Abbot Hugh naturally was, he must have had many misgivings when he reflected that to this vast expense would be added large fees and presents to Cardinals and a handsome gift to the Pope himself. The party spent a day or two in London, perhaps earnestly wishing that they were going no further than Canterbury to visit the Shrine of Becket and to share in the many pleasures which the city offered to all ranks and conditions of men. Such, however, was not the design of their journey. The cavalcade duly arrived at Canterbury, entering the city at an early hour on Easter eve. The Abbot spent part of the morning in attendance at Mass. At one o'clock a royal messenger appeared at the hostel where he was staying and demanded an interview. The messenger, whose name was Hogg, brought with him a royal writ under the great Seal. After producing it, he handed it to the Abbot with the words, "My Lord, from the King." The Abbot perused the writ, which stated that the King was aware that he was preparing to leave the realm in obedience to a summons from elsewhere. He knew also that the Abbot was to be called upon to answer charges which were brought against him. The King, by his writ, forbade the journey under penalty of the forfeiture of all his belongings if the Abbot disobeyed. He ought to know that such cases as his were amenable only to the royal courts of law, in which due justice would be done to all complainants.

Notwithstanding the prohibition, the Abbot and his attendants resumed their journey that very afternoon, and were soon in sight of the white cliffs of Dover. The Abbot had every intention of taking ship for France on the following day, which was Easter Sunday. On the morning of that day, probably at an early hour, the Abbot and his retinue heard Mass and then proceeded to the difficult task of getting their horses and other belongings on board the ship that was to convey them to Calais. We can imagine the difficulty of arranging for the embarkation of so large a party, and we know that the Channel boats of those days were often crowded to suffocation, and that a voyage in one of them was a veritable torture. All, however, was at last in

readiness for departure, and the Abbot was standing on the seashore; at his side were carriers who were to bear him in their arms through the water to his ship. The news of the passage of so distinguished a personage with his large following had spread quickly through Dover, and the crowd of spectators, made up of citizens and fellow-travellers, stood at a respectful distance from the Abbot. Just when the carriers were on the point of lifting and bearing him to his ship, there was a dramatic intervention. The sub-Constable of Dover, accompanied by sergeants bearing the royal mace, advanced along the shore and approached the Abbot. When he had passed through the crowd and was close to the Abbot, the sub-Constable cried: "Stop! Are you the Abbot of St. Alban's?" The Abbot replied, "Yes." "Then," cried the sub-Constable, "I arrest you, and I have the royal warrant for doing so."

The sub-Constable then read the royal writ, which ordered the Abbot's arrest should he be found at Dover for the purpose of "transferring himself to foreign lands," and his continuance in custody until further orders. When the writ had been read, one of the sergeants caught hold gently of the Abbot by the cloak, "attached" him, and conducted him to Dover Castle.

He was released from the castle either on the same day or on the next, probably after giving his word that he would not again attempt to leave the country without royal warrant. He lost no time in drawing up a protest against the sudden stopping of his voyage. This protest was publicly read by one of his "clerks" before notaries and many witnesses. This document indicated that the writer had made every effort to obey the Pope's commands, but had been intimidated and prevented from carrying out his wishes by the King's commands, and the fear of losing his barony, and suffering other losses if he disobeyed. "Thus," we are told, "the Lord Abbot escaped an arduous journey, which would have been injurious to himself and harmful to his Monastery."

Although Somerton had caused the Abbot so much trouble and inconvenience, and although he had spent a large sum of money and obtained papal bulls in his own behalf addressed to the Bishop of Norwich and others, his cause seemed to make little or no progress. But his temper was always sanguine. His mind was indeed so happily cast, that he rose above all disappointment, and if one expedient failed him, why, of course, he might try another! Might he not, he reflected, obtain bulls even more favourable to himself, and then go to England disguised and brave the royal displeasure, if he were caught? Having made up his mind, Somerton left Avignon for England bearing with him the bulls from which he expected so much

and from which he obtained so little. These bulls fell eventually into the hands of the Abbot. The chronicler tells us that "what these bulls contained, to whom they were addressed, and what became of them was known only to the Omniscient and to the Abbot."

Though Somerton, when he arrived in England, was metamorphosed by wearing the dress of a layman, though he had allowed his hair to grow so that his tonsure was no longer visible, he was seized in London by the sergeants of the King. As his arrival there was anticipated, a strict watch had been instituted—almost certainly at the suggestion of the Abbot. The fact that Somerton was captured is a high tribute to the detective system of those distant days.

No time was lost in arranging for the immediate future of the prisoner. He was conveyed to Marlborough, where King Edward happened to be staying, and brought into the royal presence. What the King said to the outlaw, of whom he had heard so much, and what the outlaw said in his own extenuation to the King, we do not know. The fact that he sent him back to London in the custody of the Sheriff of London, and ordered his imprisonment, is a proof of his ill opinion of him. Somerton was soon afterwards delivered to the Abbot, with the responsibility of preventing his escape. On his arrival at St. Alban's, he was lodged in the Abbey gaol and fed "with bread of affliction and with water of affliction."

Somerton, as a consequence of his return to England, was now under lock and key, and in the hands of a man who had little reason to love him or lighten his burdens. Yet he was not altogether mistaken when he decided to return to England. That he was in prison and in the hands of his enemy was a spur to his friends to help him. They soon bestirred themselves. The Abbot received letters of remonstrance from barons whom it was dangerous to offend, and to whom he was obnoxious as a supporter of Hugh de Spenser, the favourite and Minister of the King. Also supporting Somerton's cause was another baron who was destined to an evil notoriety in history. That baron was Roger Mortimer, lord of Wigmore, soon to become the paramour of the Queen. He was afterwards to be the inciter of the murder of King Edward, and, in conjunction with Queen Isabella, to rule the country for several years, then, when the cup of his iniquities was full, to expiate his crimes under the headsman's axe at Tyburn.

These powerful barons, in their letters to the Abbot, not only demanded Somerton's release from prison, but insinuated that his arrest had been procured by the Abbot through the agency of Hugh de Spenser. The Abbot was well aware that

the nobles who had written to him were bent on the destruction of the favourite. When he remembered this, he trembled for his own safety, and feared that he might himself suffer severely in the great political crisis which he knew to be at hand. He had determined that Somerton should not escape unscathed, but his resolution was gradually shaken. He held out against giving Somerton his freedom and subjecting himself to fresh humiliation as long as he could without the gravest risk. At length, when Queen Isabella and others, "whose requests it was perilous to refuse," pressed not only for Somerton's release, but for his reinstatement in the Priory, the Abbot reluctantly gave way. Somerton was set free, and the reigning Prior at Bynham lost his position, which was again occupied by the man whom he had himself displaced.

Abbot Hugh must have been vexed in heart when he saw Somerton depart in triumph from the Abbey, but the greater thrusts out the less, and the Abbot was soon involved in a struggle with the townsmen of St. Alban's so violent and so alarming that the contest with Somerton must have been dwarfed into insignificance. The Abbot did not long survive these troubles, but "bidding farewell to earthly things, commended his soul into the hands of his Creator," on the vigil of the Nativity of St. Mary, in the year 1326.

Somerton found that he had but little reason to congratulate himself on his restoration to the Priory. On the contrary, he soon saw that he was in a most unenviable position. He had pledged himself to give pensions to the magnates of the district who had helped him. He was now beset by their demands, which an empty exchequer rendered it impossible to meet. All his fine friends were thus alienated. He was confronted with averted looks, with contemptuous gestures, and pointed at with the finger of scorn. Nor, we may be sure, did the brethren of the Priory show much respect for the man who had robbed them of their comforts and made them keep a perpetual and very rigorous bent. Remedy there was none. He had tapped every resource, leased out the estates, cut down the timber, sold the plate, the jewels, the vestments, the wool, and most of the furniture. If Somerton now remained for nine years at Bynham Priory, it was only because he knew not how to find a roof elsewhere. In truth, the old elastic, resourceful Somerton was gone, and had given place to a man "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought" and weary of the world. Somerton's difficulties at last became so aggravated that he could breast such "a sea of troubles" no longer. He fled from the Priory, vanished from sight, and no one knew what had become of him.

In the meantime, as we know, Abbot Hugh had died. He

had been succeeded by Richard, the leprous Abbot, who in a few years followed him to the grave. The next Abbot was Michael, and to him fell the duty of appointing a new Prior of Bynham to take charge of the wreckage which Somerton had left.

Time sped on, and Abbot Michael had occupied his chair for some little time and there was still no news of Somerton. At last, brethren of the Abbey were startled to find a man lying at the gate, and showing by his very posture that he was a suppliant for mercy. He lay there broken in health and spirit—emaciated and exhausted. It was the wanderer Somerton. The news that he was lying at the gate was made known to the Abbot, a man of the kindest and most compassionate disposition. The Abbot sent for his Seneschal and ordered him to place the sufferer in the Infirmary. Here he was carefully tended, and remained in bed for five weeks, when he was pronounced to be convalescent. When he was still better, and felt equal to any exertion, he went to the door of the monastery to begin his public penance, due by canonical rule for his apostasy. The Abbot lightened this penance as far as he was able. His excommunication was then removed and a new discipline enjoined.

We are told nothing further about him, but we may well believe that after so many adventures and failures, and finding a good Samaritan in the Abbot and kind friends in the monks, Somerton spent the evening of his days peacefully at the Abbey.

H. P. PALMER.

THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JOHANNINE GNOSIS

THE student of religion will always regard the conquest of the East by Alexander as one of the critical and formative events of all time. It brought together East and West, and the development of religious thought was for ever to be affected by this fact. The syncretism or fusion of faiths which was its most obvious result is most powerfully illustrated—and for our immediate purpose this is an outstanding aspect—by the contact of Judaism with Greek philosophy. Under the Ptolemies Alexandria became an important centre of Judaic culture; and Philo (50 B.C. to A.D. 20), whose activity coincides with the birth of Christianity, is the thinker *par excellence* who furthered the influence of the Jewish faith in the Græco-Roman world. He remained Jewish to the core, while interpreting the Old Testa-

ment in the light of Platonic and Stoic thought, and in accordance with the spirit of the age allegorizing its content. Undoubtedly the translation of the O.T. into Greek which took place two and a half centuries before he wrote was a powerful factor in his effort to extend the influence of his faith, although it is probable his voluminous writings would only appeal to the learned few. His fundamental position, which has been ably set forth by Dr. E. F. Scott in his recent Kerr lectures on *The Gospel and its Tributaries*, concerns the question of the relation of reason to faith; while, borrowing from Greek philosophy the idea that we can only know God intellectually and accepting its assumption that Reason is the ultimate truth, he believes that God lies beyond the reach of mere intellect and can only be found in an interior fellowship of the soul and in worship. He lays greater stress on this inward approach to the transcendent Deity than on ritual, which only registers the desire of the soul for God, "Who is Himself unknowable, although He is the beginning and end of all existence." In order to bridge the chasm between God and man, he uses the Stoic category of the Logos, which for him becomes the intermediary or "High-Priest" by whose activity man can lift himself out of material conditions into union with God. The Logos is not personal except in the sense that it is a principle of the Divine Nature, not equal with God, but subordinate, yet as the emissary of a personal God powerfully co-operating with man in his efforts to attain God. And when we add to this fundamental position the Platonic conception that the visible world is only a reflection or copy of the Unseen and real spiritual universe, we can understand by what processes of thought Plato influenced the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and in particular the Johannine writer, and can further see the force of Dr. Scott's preference for the term "Alexandrian" rather than "Johannine" in designating the type of theological concepts which in the New Testament find expression in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the Fourth Gospel and First Epistle of St. John.

Now while Philo endeavoured on these lines to commend Judaism to the intellect of his age, it is hardly surprising that his method of approach to certain fundamental problems in metaphysics and ethics should powerfully influence both the above writers. The Johannine gnosis in particular was not merely concerned with finding the true basis of Christian faith for the serious thinkers of the age, but with combating the incipient Gnosticism which at the beginning of the second century affected Christian thought. It is not too much to say that the Johannine gnosis paved the way for the ultimate victory of the Church over Gnosticism. Basing his theology on the Incarna-

tion, St. John denied the Gnostic position that God was only knowable by the few elect souls or *pneumatikoi*; he destroyed the idea of the essential remoteness of God along with the whole system of intermediate mythological beings which were brought into the cosmic scheme; he rejected the ultimate dualism of spirit and matter; he emphasized the fact of sin and made the knowledge of God dependent on faith in our Lord's "name," or, as we should phrase it today, His person; and further, by the concept of "Eternal Life" as the essence of gnosis he introduced a dynamic or progressive element into the inner life and experience of the believer. The Gnostic view that the humanity of Jesus was purely phantasmal, its denial of the Resurrection and its differentiation of the Supreme God and an inferior Creator, were rejected by the Church. That Christianity gained by this protracted and bitter conflict is certain. It forced the leaders of the Church to examine the bases of Christian theology, it fostered a reasoned critique of the documents of the faith, it produced a New Testament canon, and, above all, it gave a new impulse to mysticism.

Like all the early heresies, however, Gnosticism has persisted. A popular novelist like Mr. H. G. Wells adopted Marcion's idea of two Gods in his *God the Invisible King*. Modern theosophy, which is represented in every large community by devoted if small groups of adherents, also perpetuates the idea that there is a supreme impersonal deity and below this being "a kind of pseudo-god for the solar system." Salvation consists in being liberated from material conditions. The idea of moral guilt has no place in their ethical system, evil being but the defect of goodness. Christ was one of the masters of gnosis, and we work out our salvation by a series of reincarnations—and so forth. Rudolf Steiner broke with the Theosophists to produce a new system of thought, which he named Anthroposophy, based on a theistic view of the universe. He sought to explore the spiritual forces which lie dormant in man and to remodel all human activities—art, science, education, economics, politics, and the sphere of freedom or spirit. Christ is for him the central Fact of the spiritual world as the supreme Initiate or Master of gnosis, and, curiously enough, Steiner placed the emphasis on His death rather than on His Incarnation, inasmuch as He thereby transfigured death into a parting with the earthly body and the return of the soul to its spiritual home. To be in harmony with the divine activities is to be saved. The "Christ-impulse" is to purge all human existence. Yet the true life can only be attained by the occult processes* of purgation and illumination. The leap of faith—the immediacy of a personal choice—has no

* Cf. his *Way of Initiation* and *Christianity as Mystical Fact*.

place in his system. Nevertheless, it remained a kind of Platonic-Christian Gnosticism set forth in a stimulating form which was bound to allure certain types of mind to the search for the ultimate reality, and the writer was clearly influenced by the Fourth Gospel, which may be regarded as his textbook for his conception of Christianity.

It has been asserted by advanced critics like Loisy that the Fourth Gospel was written by a master of gnosis who only knows "a liturgical Christ," a Jew in neither origin nor spirit, but a convert from Paganism profoundly influenced by the mystery cults, and therefore fundamentally sacramentalist in his setting of Christianity. But the Fourth Gospel demonstrates, when carefully examined, a remarkable independence of thought in relation to the whole system of cult and belief expressed in the mystery-religions. This has been well brought out by Schweitzer, who considered that the Johannine doctrine of the Incarnation lifted Christianity into a region far above these cults, while, we may add, the Christian *praxis* as contrasted with the spiritual presupposition of the sacraments may be rightly regarded as standing within the current of mystery ideas and influence. The truth expressed in the Prologue that the Logos of God, His supreme Word or Reason, took human and visible shape in Christ, expressed for all time the possibility of the combination of human nature and spirit which is the sacramental principle. As a Life-giving Spirit, the Son of Man was for ever manifesting Himself, interpenetrating the material world with His presence. The bread and wine henceforth became the flesh and the blood of the Son of Man in the sense that by virtue of the working of the Spirit in these elements they are permeated with life. "It is the Spirit that giveth life." We live in a sacramental universe. Nothing can be more lucid than Schweitzer's interpretation of this aspect of Johannine theology. "The naive conception that Jesus instituted the sacraments is not recognized by the Johannine gnosis. According to it, He did not establish them, but created and predicted them." Further, the two principles which practically form the basis of Johannine thought are: (1) The Spirit can only work upon men in combination with matter; (2) the Spirit only becomes present in this state as a consequence of the exaltation of our Lord. "Anyone who has once recognized these presuppositions will give up, once for all, the search for a primitive element which is to be explained from the nature religions. On the other hand, it is certain that Christianity here presents itself as the most highly developed Greek mystery religion which it is possible to conceive."* While St. Paul appears to have taken over baptism

* See *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, published in English under the title *Paul and his Interpreters*, pp. 201-203.

and the Lord's Supper, as something given—the first as a symbol of inward cleansing from John the Baptist and the second as a memorial feast which he connected with the expectation of the Lord's return—the discourses of Chapters III. and VI. in the Fourth Gospel present both sacraments under another concept, that of the ultimate connexion of spirit and matter, as vehicles, in other words, of a life-giving Spirit.

That the Johannine theology is complementary both of the Synoptists and St. Paul cannot seriously be questioned. By whomsoever the Fourth Gospel was composed—whether by the Evangelist, the tradition of whose early death is generally regarded to be quite inadequately attested, or by John the Presbyter, whose very existence depends only on a single fragment of Papias, or by a redactor who produced the completed work, basing it on historical or other data furnished by the Evangelist—the fact remains that we are presented with an exposition of Christianity current in Ephesian circles at the beginning of the second century. If we ask why the Gospel was accepted by the Church and eventually became canonical, Professor Burkitt is surely right when he says that it was not because it bore the name of John, for the *Gospel of Peter* was rejected and so was the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*: it was because of its intrinsic merit and significance as an interpretation of the Person of Christ which satisfied both the intellectual and spiritual needs of the age. The historical element in the Gospel, though important, is of less moment than the theological, if we take into account the supreme aim of the author. The discourses are generally understood to be constructed by the author upon data furnished by memory or report, and it is open to us to regard such narratives as the meeting with the woman of Samaria or the healing of the man born blind as symbolic, though there is a remarkable verisimilitude in both: or to consider the events of the marriage feast at Cana or the raising of Lazarus as allegorical: for our view of specific portions of the Gospel, or even of the method of the author, can hardly affect our sense of the spiritual value of the whole. It may be true that he even uses the Synoptic material with the possible exception of Matthew, but objective history is not his primary aim: it is to interpret Christ as the Logos of God—in other words, to unfold the permanent values of the Christ of experience. If he has known Him after the flesh, he knows Him as such no longer, in the sense that while the fact of His humanity remains, it is as a Spiritual Being that He demonstrates His reality and power in the inner life of the believer.

How far he succeeded in this aim can be gathered on reflection. The particular form and content of his doctrine have

proved to be the basis of all subsequent thought in relation to the vital themes of Christian truth. It is notorious that when we pass to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and their successors we are conscious that they are derivative, not original; Clement and Origen, Athanasius and Augustine—at least in his earlier theology—built upon the foundations of the Johannine theology.

What then is the conception of God found in the Johannine gnosis? The "Father" of the Synoptists is here, but with an added richness of metaphysical and ethical content. Let us link up the Gospel with the First Epistle, which is generally regarded as subsequent to the Gospel and as summarizing in brief, pregnant aphorisms its fundamental ideas. We meet the two transcendent statements "God is Love" and "God is Spirit," affirmations which underlie the whole of Christian theology, both expressing ultimate values in ethics and experience; the one enshrining the self-limiting or renunciatory principle in the Deity, the other indicating the fount of all inspiration within the consciousness of mankind. The other concepts of "Light" and "Life" are but enrichments of these primary affirmations: "light" (with which we may associate the parallel term "Glory") as expressing the all-diffusive and self-communicating aspect of Love; while "Life" or "the eternal life" is the Divine principle within the soul, which becomes operative and effectual through believing "in the name of" or "on" Christ. Another pair of associated ideas are "truth" and "witness," the former applied to Christ Himself as well as to His message. The "truth" was already in man, but man had failed to recognize it: yet the great spiritual teachers like the prophets and the Baptist bore witness to it. Pre-eminently "truth" comes through Christ in the sense that its fulness was only declared by Him. It is not a merely theoretical knowledge. We "do" the truth: we live it out and find in it our real freedom. All these aspects of the Divine self-manifestation arise out of his fundamental conception of the Logos.

If ever there was a clear example of inspiration it lies in the choice of this term, which in itself and by the way in which it was worked out and applied lifts the New Testament to a height unapproached by any other religious classic. Derived from the O.T. conception of the "Word of God," which was further developed, as we have seen, in Philo's Judæo-Hellenistic theology, it becomes in the thought of St. John a theological term with a wider and more fruitful application than the Palestinian *Memra* or the Alexandrian *Logos*. It expresses the interior divine relations independently of the actual revelation to man. It contains in germ the Trinitarian view of the Deity by going beyond the impersonal reason or immanent word (*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*)

of Greek theology and emerging as personal (λόγος ἐνυπόστατος). It explains further all the history of spiritual aspiration from the most primitive ages of human life to the present day. It compresses into one idea the thought of the first verse of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, opening with two superb adverbs (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως), enunciates the principle of comparative religion. Every feeling after God in any human soul was due to the inworking of the Logos, and when he sums up his doctrine in the saying "The Logos became flesh" St. John brings us to the splendid culmination of the revelatory process in history.

The first verse carries in its three clauses three profound conceptions: (1) that of pre-existence, though, as Westcott says, the affirmation of *existence* suggests a loftier conception than *pre-existence*, which "is embarrassed by the idea of time"; (2) that of existence co-equal with God, as if the being of the Logos was only realized in perfect communion with God; and (3) that of the essentially Divine nature of the Logos, Deity not being aspect or function, but essence. Profound as this statement is, it is made equally clear that the humanity (σάρξ) of the Logos is not visionary or delusive. We can easily see how attractive the Doketic theory was to minds who stumbled at the thought of the Heavenly Man living a lowly human life which was to end in the incredible sufferings of the cross: even Christians as well as non-Christians were liable to be misled by this specious theory. But while the Synoptists present us, speaking generally, with the life and teaching of the Jesus of history, St. John leaves us in no doubt as to the significance of His person. With his conception Christianity stands or falls. Even in the Synoptists we can feel that He is regarded as one worthy of and one who actually received exceptional devotion and reverent adoration, and even worship, but the Johannine interpretation envisages Him from the standpoint of Christian experience, as if the author felt he knew Him far better than when he had seen Him in the days of His flesh. In fact, Jesus Christ is clearly no Gnostic emanation or demi-god: He is to be interpreted as co-equal with God—"of one substance" (for this, the Nicene term, may fairly be regarded as exegetical of the second clause of the first verse), and yet at the same time a truly historical Person who lived and died and vanished into the unseen to be for ever a Life-giving Spirit and Guide into all reality.

It is this concept of the perpetual Presence of the Human-Divine personality of Christ that lies at the heart of the Johannine gnosis. It is the explanation of the great final discourses, and takes us a step further in the direction of a Trinitarian conception of the being of God. When, *e.g.*, we read (xiv. 16-17),

"I will ask my Father, who will give you another Comforter" (or Paraclete), "the Spirit of Truth which the world cannot receive because it neither discerns nor knows him," or again (xiv. 26): "the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit which the Father will send in my name, he (*ἐκεῖνος*) shall teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you," we instantly feel that the writer speaks out of his own vivid experience with its quickened power of memory and receptiveness, and yet expresses too the implicitly Trinitarian character of his own thinking; the Spirit being the eternal bond between Father and Son conceived as energies of the Divine Love, or rather as Himself the energy by which both factors of the Godhead became real to the human consciousness. If in Ephesian Christian circles anything like the Monarchian conception of God was current, it would explain the mould of the writer's thought, but what is more likely is that the Eternal Parousia of Christ is in his mind. In a sense this was yet to be realized—it is described in its own setting proleptically (xv. 26)—"When the Paraclete is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." The use of the word "another" with Paraclete (xiv. 16) is definitely connected with the withdrawal of the bodily presence of the speaker.

The immanence of the Spirit as Life-giving, both as regards intellect and spirit, throws light on the Johannine concept of "Eternal Life," which is defined as the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ whom He sent. The very form of this phrase, which does not connote absolute knowledge but progressive recognition, is in keeping with the peculiar function or dynamic of the Spirit. Gnosis for St. John is not a static experience, but an evolutionary process, a getting to know, a perpetual movement within the Eternal towards the Eternal.

And this leads up naturally to the eschatological ideas of the Johannine writings. The Synoptic and Pauline "Kingdom of Heaven" is no longer the dominant idea. We discover that the idea of anti-Christ is not that of some outstanding adversary of the truth—*e.g.*, Satan or St. Paul's "man of lawlessness" or the Nero of the Apocalypse: anti-Christ is now the heretical Spirit which denies, as the Gnostics did, the divinity of Christ. In that sense "the last hour" had come: it was a crisis: the heresy had been unmasked and faith was the victory that would overcome the world. The form which anti-Christ takes is Protean: there are varieties in the teaching of the heretics, but it is sufficient to meet them all with the declaration that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God. Moreover, a change has taken place in relation to the popular idea of the immediate return of the

Lord. The perpetual Presence of the Spirit of Christ taken in connexion with the incidents of Pentecost—not indeed mentioned by the writer, but known already to his readers—replaces the pictorial and external eschatology of the Synoptists and the earlier letters of St. Paul. Not that all traces of it are absent from the Fourth Gospel—*e.g.*, in v. 28: “the hour cometh in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life and they that have done ill unto the resurrection of judgment.” If these words truly represent an utterance of Jesus, such familiar ideas are contradicted by other passages where judgment is regarded as an eternal fact. “I came not to judge the world but to save it.” This statement has to be associated with another according to which His own Person, when taken in connexion with the world’s attitude to it, is a judgment. “Now is the judgment of this world,” He said on the eve of His passion. A man is already judged by his attitude towards Christ. He came to evoke a faculty of discrimination (*εἰς κρίμα*, ix. 39) “that those who see not may see and those who see may become blind.” The centre of gravity is no longer a great assize at the end of the world, but lies in the present. “Sin’s real punishment,” says Dr. W. Morgan, “is not physical death or even suffering, but exclusion from the higher life that comes into being through the birth from above.” The popular idea of Hell has vanished, but the Church retained the old ideas about the last things until the emergence of the idea of Purgatory produced an important modification of the scheme. Some form of remedial discipline in the unseen has always appealed to thinking people. The sublimely picturesque conception of the descent into Hell is drawn from non-Christian sources, and was perhaps suggested by pagan parallels, though presented in a Christianized form, the idea being that from all the powers of darkness and all ranks of the dead trophies will be won by the Redeemer, more particularly those who knew not the Lord—*e.g.*, the disobedient in the days of Noah, the Patriarchs (Irenæus), or the Sodomites and other similar sects (Marcion). Judgment will be meted out to the heathen world in accordance with the standards of their spiritual knowledge and their response to the same.

St. John had lived during the era when the early return of Christ was expected. This hope ended in disappointment. It had no authority in the utterances of Jesus. It is true that He looked forward to some permanent manifestation of His power in the future. The phrase “the second coming” does not occur in the N.T. What we find is the idea of a coming Kingdom, its date left indeterminate, which runs through His teaching. It

was left to St. John to effect a complete change of view in the form of this expectation. He speaks, indeed, of "a last day" and "a coming again," but those phrases have to be interpreted in the light of our Lord's final declaration. The Presence or Parousia had already begun with the departure of Jesus into the unseen ("I go away and I come unto you," xiv. 28). It was not to assume any catastrophic or spectacular form at a given moment, but was for ever to be realized in the hearts of mankind.

The old conceptions of judgment and the return of Christ still linger on. But just as a slow revolution has taken place in our conception of the inspiration and real character of the Bible, so in eschatology a similar change is in process: it is certainly due, perhaps overdue. History is full of critical moments when the imagery of the Apocalypse will recur to the mind of the Christian, but so long as we believe in a reign of God over human life, we must also believe that He can and will overrule the checks in human progress, the uprush of primitive passions and consequent lowering of ideals, to His own ends. There is a supreme event to which the whole creation moves. We must in a sense visualize a climax or end of things. It takes the form of a Kingdom of the Spirit already in being, but still in the fulness of time to be realized, when the conflict between good and evil will come to an end. For this ending of the dualism of good and evil, however inconceivable philosophically or as an actual event, the hopeful fact is the manifestation of God in Christ. It is not His will that sinners shall be exterminated, and thereupon that Christ shall reign for a thousand years or many thousands. It is His will that the consummation will be achieved by the slow transformation of human life until it manifests from end to end the mind of Christ. There are those who think this is a vain hope and who believe we are engaged in a losing battle, while with a certain splendid heroism they still maintain the moral ideal for which they can find no supernatural basis.

But from the eschatology of the N.T. we can extract one supreme truth which is of the very essence of the Christian faith, that "the world's no blot for us: it means intensely and means good." The one justification of our faith and our conflict with evil is the conviction that God co-operates with the good, and with good wherever found. Nor can we believe that we should have been taught to pray "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as in heaven," if such petitions did not represent the ultimate purpose of creation. Our hope for the future rests, not on an appearance or a visible return, but on a *manifestation*. This is the Johannine conception. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall be *mani-*

fested"—manifested as He really is over the whole range of human life—"we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

On the other hand, Mr. Edwyn Bevan* is not prepared to abandon the idea of a future reign of Christ on earth which is to precede the eternal state. He says that "if the literal presence of Christ upon the earth 1,900 years ago is a fact of a great spiritual importance, I cannot see why the belief in His presence upon earth at some future age should be unspiritual." He instances the experiences of St. Paul and St. Stephen and the number of people who have declared that they saw Christ just before death, and argues that "if these experiences become normal and common, instead of rare, would not that be indeed the return of the Lord?" It is an interesting question, but such visions are for ever possible, and however widely they may be realized—and there is no one who will not fervently pray for their multiplication—the Presence of Christ upon earth is a conception which cannot stand out of relation to the supreme fact of the Incarnation. For the Incarnation is not to be consummated in a vision of Christ which comes in moments of ecstasy or deep spiritual emotion, or even is normal in common everyday experience; it surely carries with it nothing less than the transformation of all civilized life after the image and ethic of Jesus—the enshrining, in other words, of the divine in the human. This is the real return of the Lord indicated in the profound Johannine theology, and it is in this sense that we can interpret what thousands of devout souls are really yearning and praying for—such a manifestation of the spirit of Christ that the world of mankind may indeed become a veritable city of God.

R. MARTIN POPE.

* See his *Christianity and Hellenism*, pp. 224-225.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE have received a copy of an attractive booklet relating to the Festival of English Church Art to be held (under the auspices of the Church Crafts League) at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, from June 16 to July 2. The Festival aims at exhibiting every aspect of the art of the English Church, including music, drama, architecture, sculpture, painting, etc.; and it is to be accompanied by lectures, conferences, and demonstrations. The Chairman is the Rev. Jocelyn Perkins, whose name is ample guarantee for the efficiency and quality of the Festival. We hope that it will be warmly supported.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

THEOLOGY has done well to print in full the Bishop of Birmingham's interesting sermon on human immortality in relation to the animal ancestry of man. But I observe that the real problem seems to have been somewhat obscured. This is not merely that (as thoughtful people began to say after 1859) "if we are derived from the brutes, we may expect to perish like the brutes." It is much more precise.

Put quite shortly, it comes to this. In the happy pre-Darwinian days, it was a reasonable surmise that man, a new creature, the crown of creation, made in God's image, should have received a new and wonderful heritage—the gift of individual survival. But when people had grasped the fact that modern man could be traced back (directly or collaterally) to *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, and (unless all analogy is hopelessly misleading) inferentially a great deal farther, it was inevitable that they should also realize that, if every modern human being has (or is) an immortal soul—then somewhere in the line of ancestry of every man, woman, and child now living, there must have been a point (it does not matter in the least whether it was at the human or humanoid stage or much earlier) at which two parents, both fated to perish wholly with their bodies, produced one or more offspring, practically indistinguishable from themselves in physical or mental characteristics, to whom was given this marvellous endowment—that he (or they) should not end with physical death. The point, of course, is that it is an entirely different problem from the question of the beginnings of reason, self-consciousness, sense of shame, and so on. These we can see growing before our eyes. The rudiments exist in the "lower animals" and gradually increase as the creature rises in the evolutionary scale. But it is difficult to conceive a graduated immortality. So far as we can see, any organism—whether a geranium, a potato, a pig, or a man—must either perish with its physical structure or not so perish. The Bishop's suggestion that immortality may be granted when the race or the individual is spiritually far enough advanced to be worthy of it does not seem to help us. It merely presents the same problem from a slightly different point of view. The difference between "mortal" and "immortal" is enormous. By all analogy the spiritual difference between Tomlinson (just not worthy of survival) and Tomlinson¹ (just worthy) is extremely small.

Probably the problem was appreciated by those who knew something of embryology long before 1859. But it does not seem to have attracted general attention until the *Origin of Species* appeared. *The Descent of Man* (1871) further accentuated it.

I am, Sir, yours truly,
H. GORDON MACKENZIE.

NOTES

I.—EPISCOPACY AND APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY

THE recent book by Dr. Streeter on *The Primitive Church* agrees with the earlier book by Dr. Headlam on *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion* in the conclusion that, whatever else may be said of the principle of Episcopacy in the Church, it cannot be proved that there is apostolic authority behind it. The following suggestions are put forward in the belief that the evidence adduced can be read in a different light and be seen to lead to an entirely opposite conclusion.

Before, however, bringing forward the point that appears to have escaped the notice of these distinguished writers, there are one or two lesser considerations that have a certain importance in this connection.

The first is this: that this matter is not, as is sometimes supposed, one of terminology. If it be proved that the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος were more or less interchangeable in apostolic times, the existence of "Episcopacy" is not thereby disproved in that period. It is sufficient to show that there existed a threefold ministry, consisting locally of presbyter-bishops and deacons, and supervised by some superior officer. Such supervision is obviously seen in the N.T., and, as would naturally be expected, the area of supervision is seen to contract with the increase of the membership of the Church. In this way, the delegation of his supervisory work by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus is easily understood. (Why is it, by the way, that some writers speak of these as "temporary" apostolic delegates? There seems to be not the slightest evidence of the temporary character of their work in the Pastoral Epistles.)

The other minor point is the following: In the distinction which is so often drawn between the two types of ministry which are thought to be found in the N.T., the Apostles are usually included in the "charismatic" ministry, no doubt because of the references in the *Didache*. But it should not be overlooked that in the N.T. they belong quite as clearly to the "regular" ministry. It was St. Paul who appointed presbyters in every Church.

But the chief consideration which I have in mind has, I venture to think, real weight, and, if the induction is correct, it overthrows the whole argument of both Dr. Streeter and Dr. Headlam. The facts upon which the induction is based are these:

(a) There is no doubt that there existed a threefold ministry at Jerusalem by the middle of the first century. St. James is clearly the president of the Church in the Holy City, and there are, with him, presbyters and deacons. This fact is not disposed of by pointing out that St. James probably owed his position to his membership of the Messianic family, and, possibly as well, to a commanding personality. However he attained his position it is still the case that he held it, and the fact is of great importance.

(b) The Ignatian Epistles are good evidence for the existence of developed Episcopacy, not only at Antioch, but also in each of the places in Asia Minor to which they are addressed. This evidence has been assailed on two grounds: (1) That the emphasis laid on Episcopacy is an argument that the principle was novel and without general acceptance. It would seem, on the other hand, that the emphasis is not on Episcopacy at all, *per se*, but on unity. A reading of the Epistle to the Philadelphians, for example, puts this, surely, beyond doubt. (2) The hypothesis that the *Didache* is Antiochene is also used to weaken the evidence of Ignatius. But a hypothesis is not a fact, and no sound argument can be based on an unproved hypothesis. In any case, the usual impression made by the reading of the *Didache* is that it was written for a rural community, not at all for the needs of a busy city.

(c) There are also the traditions connected with the residence of St. John at Ephesus and the reference to Diotrephes in 3 John.

It is therefore pretty certain that Episcopacy was the rule at Jerusalem by the middle of the first century, and at Antioch and throughout the chief centres of Asia by the end of the first century, or soon after. That is to say, that Episcopacy is first seen in its developed form where the apostolic influence was strongest—i.e., at Jerusalem—and next in those parts where also the Apostles had the greatest part in the foundation and organization of the Church. Antioch had known St. Paul, St. Barnabas and St. Peter, and the rest of Asia Minor St. Paul, St. Barnabas, and St. John—and, for the purpose of this argument, it does not matter whether St. John of Ephesus was the son of Zebedee or not, since he is in any case generally considered to have been of the Apostolic band. This is the conclusion which I believe to be of such importance, for, if it be true that the emergence of developed Episcopacy corresponds with the intensity of apostolic influence, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that it is to them that the development is due. In all probability, the constitution of the Church at Jerusalem, whether it arose spontaneously or whether it was based on instructions from the Lord Himself, served as a model for local Churches elsewhere, and the Apostles encouraged the similar appointment of leaders in those Churches, partly by provision from the outside, as in the cases of Timothy and Titus, and partly by promotion from the ranks of the presbyter-bishops. But it is incredible that so momentous a development should have taken place under the eye of the Apostles at Jerusalem and of St. John at Ephesus, or in parts so saturated with their influence as Antioch and Asia Minor, apart from their direct approval and encouragement.

In short, I would suggest that Dr. Streeter's formula "original diversity of order" should be amended to "original disorder, leading under apostolic guidance to unity of order."

E. R. OXBY.

II.—AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF HENRY EARL OF CLARENDON

The following is a transcript of a letter* written by Henry Hyde, second Earl of Clarendon, to Dr. Tenison, Rector of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. It was written on the

* The letter is in the possession of the writer. It was purchased from Messrs. P. J. and A. E. Dobell in October, 1928. It had been in their possession for four or five years, and was probably bought by them at a sale at Messrs. Sotheby's.

day on which the Comprehension Bill passed its third reading in the Lords, and was sent to the Commons. Clarendon was opposed to the Comprehension scheme. He noted in his diary on March 11: "In the evening I went to see Lord Abingdon and took my leave of him. My lord was much concerned for the Church, and very angry at the Bill of Comprehension. The Bishop of St. Asaph* went with me: he is deep in that comprehending project."† Again, on April 25, he wrote: "In the afternoon I went to the Apothecaries' Garden with Dr. Tenison: we had much discourse about the designed comprehension; which I, wonder so good a man should be fond of."‡ On the 16th of that month, however, Parliament, by its address to the King asking him to summon Convocation "to be advised with in ecclesiastical matters," had really made an end of the Bill.

C. E. WHITING.

SWALLOWFIELD,
Aprill ye 8th, 1689.

S^r

I give you many thanks for your lre of y^e 5th instant; I should have been very happy if you could have afforded me your Company here for two or three days, where you should have been very welcome; it would have been a very charitable Visite to one who has been soe perfectly retired, as I have this moneth past, not only wthout all maⁿer of Company, but even without y^e entertainment of almost any of the Pamphletts w^{ch} come dayly out. I have read the lre to a Member of Parliament, w^{ch} you sent me, in favour of y^e Bill for Uniting Protestants; I shall not presume to say much upon it, knowing well how incompetent I am to meddle wth a subject of that high nature, further then by praying for a perfect Union among Protestants: However, to you, who know soe many of my Weaknesses, I will take the Liberty to make two or three observations upon reading this lre, wth submission to your excellent Judgement: I can say nothing to y^e Bill of Union mention'd in y^e lre, having never seen it.

The first thing I observe, is y^t much weight is layd upon the Condescensions w^{ch} have been already promised, Promises, as y^e lre sayes, are sacred things; & noe doubt, they will be performed to the full, by those who made them; I suppose, by Promises, is meant what the seven eminent B^ps sayd in their Petition to King James in May last: the words are, as I remember (for I have not y^e Petition by me) to this effect; *That they were willing to come to such a temper, wth reference to Protestant Dissenters, as should be consider'd & settled in Parliament & Convocation.* Now it cannot be denied that the 39. Articles, & our Lyturgie, were first consider'd and framed in Convocation, the Representatives of our Nationall Church; & afterwards ratified in Parliament: And to shew what Deference Parliaments have had to the Convocation, it may not be amisse to observe, That y^e Lyturgie, as amended on Convocation Anno 1662. was read over entirely in both Houses of Parliament, wthout soe much as making one Alteration in it: And therefore certainly whatever Alterations are thought fitt to be made in things already settled, they would be better received, & more esteem'd, even in Parliament, if they were first contrived, and throughly deliberated upon in Convocation; the Members whereof (I

* William Lloyd.

† *The State Letters of Henry Earl of Clarendon*, ii., p. 177. Oxford. 1763.

‡ *Ibid.*, ii., p. 184.

hope I may say it wthout offence) are more proper Judges of things of this nature, then the Members of either House of Parliament can be thought to be. In the Preface to the Common Prayer, it is sayd; *In y^e Reigns of severall Princes of blessed Memory, since y^e Reformation, the Church, upon just & weighty Considerations, her thereunto moving, hath yeilded to make such Alterations in some particulars, as, in their respective times, were thought convenient.* Upon w^{ch}, I cannot but be of opinion, wth submission to better Judgements, that this busines should first begin in Convocation; the Parliament, (wthout whose Conjunction & Allowance nothing can be binding) will afterwards retain, reject, or alter what they thinke fitt. In the meantime, I hope the Promises mention'd in y^e lre, will not be strayn'd further then their nature and sense will bear:

That a Review of our Constitution may be now much better made, then it could have been formerly; Or that this is a proper time for it; is not soe cleer to my Judgement, as it seems to be to the Author of the lre; but I will say noe more to it at present, because it will not be long before I shall have the good fortune to see you.

The lre sayes; *I am well assured both by Conversation & by lres lately sent from Holland, Geneva, Switzerland, & other places; That they look upon the Church of England, at this time, as the Center of Protestant Unity; and esteem the Conditions proposed in this Bill (w^{ch} have been communicated to them) as termes full of Christian Moderation, & fitt for the uniting of Protestants.* Of this Bill in debate, I can say nothing, having never seen it; but it were worth knowing, how the Churches above mention'd came to be acquainted wth the Conditions proposed in it; and how they have signified their approbation of them; Whether the lres from y^e severall Places mention'd, are from private men only, or by Authority of their Synods or Consistories; by w^{ch} it would appear what Assurance those Churches give of coming into this Union; for as that would be one very important reason to promote the Bill; soe if I were to give my Vote in it, I should desire to be well satisfyed in that particular, as well as in some others, w^{ch} I do not name, because I shall have nothing to doe in it.

It is alleaged in the lre; *Soe farr as we may learne y^e Genius of men from their Writings, ArchBpp Usher, Bpp Sandersom, & Dr. Hammond &c, had they been now alive, would, with all zeale, have promoted this Bill of Union.* How farr those excellent men would have promoted any Bill, now in agitation, is hard to say: I will not pretend to have read the Writings of those learned men soe carefully as I ought to have done; but some of them I have perused; & if I am not very much mistaken, both the ArchBpp & Dr. Hammond, in severall of their Pieces, seem to have noe great opinion of those who then separated from our Church. I have upon a late occasion perused most of the Tracts written by Bpp Sanderson, from whence I have recd great satisfaction, wth reference to some Scruples: He lived some time, tho not long enough for y^e good of the Church, after y^e Restoration; And by many things w^{ch} he writt, I thinke had no very good opinion of the then Dissenters, who, in truth, had too great a share in those Disorders w^{ch} occasion'd for a time, the Overthrow, both of Church & State; as appears in his Case of y^e Engagement, written in the year 1650. wherein he sayes, speaking of the Presbyterians, *Most of whom, truly for my own part, when we speak of Learning and Conscience, I hold to be very little considerable.* What his thoughts of them were afterwards, since the Restoration, I think is cleer by the Preface to y^e Common Prayer, w^{ch} was drawn by that great and pious Man, Bpp Sander-

son, & soe farr approved by the Convocation then sitting, as to be made theirs: Every line of that Preface, deserves, in my opinion, great Consideration. I shall take the liberty to repeat here only one Claus of it. *And therefore of the sundry Alterations proposed to us, we have rejected all such, as were either of dangerous Consequence (as secretly striking at some establish'd Doctrine, or laudable practise of the Church of England, or indeed of y^e whole Catholick Church of Christ) or else of noe Consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vayn.* What those Alterations were, w^{ch} were then proposed, & rejected; you very well know; & I beleve it will not be for y^e credite of the Dissenters to have some of them remembred. I beseech you now S^r, is it not most convenient, y^t what was settled upon soe great deliberation, not above 26 yeares since, upon many Conferences wth, & Hearings of, all the principall Dissenters then in being, some of whom are yett alive; should, if Alterations are now thought needfull, be revised again by the body of our Clergie? And ought not that to be done in Convocation, before the Bill of Union passe?

The l^re sayes; *We have lost one Juncture already, at the returne of K. Charles y^e second; And y^t we have now an other favourable season; And that, such as was never yett offer'd to us, by reason of the League at this time between the Protestant Princes & States.* Of the present favourable season I will not say any thing, it being indeed more proper for Discourse, then a l^re from me: But as to the Juncture at the returne of K: Charles y^e second; I hope it was not totally lost; I knew a great deal of the Transactions of those times; and tho many things might have been done, w^{ch} were omitted; such has been, & ever will be the fate, in publick Revolutions; And tho perhaps some of our Clergie had not then soe healing a temper of mind, as was to have been wish'd; the reasons whereof need not be remembred; noe men are without some faylings; yett it can be proved, y^t the extravagant unreasonablenesse of the Dissenters at that time, was the true Cause y^t no more was done, upon that glorious opportunity, towards a Union wth those who pretended to hold the same Doctrine wth the Church of England. I shall now end your present trouble, because I will not enter too farr into a matter out of my Sphear; And I hope you will not thinke, by any thing I have sayd, y^t I doe not heartily concurr in the designe of the l^re; that is, a perfect Union among Protestants, w^{ch} ought to be endeavour'd by all good men how improbable soever the obtayning it may prove; and for w^{ch} my most fervent Prayers shall never be wanting. Whether this Bill now depending, be the best method, or this the proper Season, to obtain that desirable Union, is the Question, w^{ch} must be the busines of the wisest men to determine: My Wishes are, that in the endeavours of bringing People into the Church, we may not shutt a greater number out, then are likely to come in; for there are weake Brethren of all sides. I shall conclude, S^r, wth asking your pardon for this too long l^re; And give me leave to say, it is your duty to correct my Errors, & I expect it from you, there being noe man under your Charge, who has greater Reverence for you, upon all accounts, then

S^r

Your most affectionate &

most humble Servant

CLARENDON.

Endorsed

For the Reverend

D^r TenisonFrom y^e Earl of Clarendon.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses. January, 1930.

THE first article in this number is a careful discussion of a question debated by the followers of St. Thomas Aquinas arising out of his doctrine about the relations between nature and grace—namely, the distinction between the passive potency of obedience to the Creator in all created things and the capacity for supernatural grace to be found in human nature. FR. CHARLIER, who writes the article, lays down as a guiding principle of all Thomist teaching that “grace does not destroy nature, but brings it to its perfection.” Thus the Vision of God is the natural end or aim of the soul of man, and this end is realized and brought to perfection by supernatural grace. Supernature, or grace added to nature, completes nature and brings its capacities to actuality.

Nature, accordingly, has a certain capacity *vis-à-vis* supernatural grace: *intellectualis natura est capax summi Boni*. Although the Beatific Vision is above human nature in the sense that that nature cannot of its own virtue arrive at it, yet as regards passive capacity it is not above it in so far as it has been made in God's Image. There is here implied an important Thomist distinction between the active and the passive order. The human intellect has in this way a double potency, first to the acquirement of certain perfections towards which it moves as to its proper objects, and secondly to other perfections to which it must be moved by an extrinsic Mover. It is, moreover, this second class of perfections, culminating in the Divine Vision, which can alone finally satisfy the desires of man. Another distinction must be made also. Every creature, as creature, has a potency “of obedience”—that is to say, it is, by its creaturely nature, fitted to obey whatever commands the Creator shall lay upon it. In virtue of this potency all miracles are possible, *supra naturam*, *contra naturam* or *præter naturam*. But from this capacity of all creatures to obey God the passive capacity of human nature to Divine grace is to be distinguished. The passive capacity for grace belongs to human nature, not merely as a creature, but as a creature made in God's Image. Grace is not *supra* or *contra* or *præter* human nature, not being in itself miraculous at all. It is the perfection of a passive capacity already in human nature itself. It is not, however, a natural perfection, but always demands for its realization the intervention of the supernatural Mover. The subject is to be continued in a later number of the Review.

Another article deals with the sense in which Faith is necessary to Salvation. The conclusion is that, while Faith is necessary, this need not imply an explicit Act of Faith in Revealed Truth. In the case, for example, of heathen who have never heard of Christ, God does not impose conditions impossible of fulfilment.

The remainder of the number is occupied with an article on the “Origins of Probabilism” and the usual full reviews of theological books. The article on “Probabilism” prints *in extenso* a long catena of extracts from sixteenth-century moralists, in Latin and Spanish, to determine how far De Medina (1527-1581) was responsible for the formulation of probabilist doctrine. It is contended that later writers misunderstood what he meant by “probable,” taking it to be “relatively doubtful,” whereas his real meaning was the older sense of “certain in a contingent matter.”

W. R. V. B.

Analecta Bollandiana. Vol. xlviii., Nos. 1 and 2.

The most important article in this number is one of the most illuminative the learned FR. DELEHAYE has ever written. It is entitled "Loca Sanctorum," and it is concerned with what may be called the Topography of the Saints (cf. A. Baillet, 1704, whose work was concerned with "la mort, la sépulture et le culte des saints"). The memory of the saints belongs not so much to where they were born as to where they died: "L'hagiographe ne connaît point S. Antoine de Lisbonne, mais S. Antoine de Padoue. La cité du saint est donc celle qu'il se choisit en y laissant sa dépouille mortelle; c'est le coin de terre où on lui rend les premiers honneurs."

A great deal has been written since Baillet: by no one so thoroughly as by Benedict XIV. and Fr. Delehaye himself. The present article is so good that I for one should like to ask the editor of THEOLOGY to publish a translation of it in two or three numbers. Very briefly now. Churches at first were dedicated only to God: the church is *dominicum*. Then came the association with the relics of saints. There is the inscription by St. Ambrose: "Condidit Ambrosius templum dominoque sacrauit nomine Apostolico munere reliquiis." We have the veneration of martyrs beginning locally: and where their relics are placed there is a church named after them: early instances are SS. Gervasius and Protasius, Nazairus and Celsus. There is the interesting and puzzling *Titulus Vestinae*. From the end of the fourth century dedications are common, and Fr. Delehaye gives illuminative examples. Then he goes through what may be called the geography of the subject: special attention is paid to England, Scotland and Ireland.

By the way he shows the common view that the cult of St. George was introduced through the Crusades is erroneous: it was much earlier. Then there is the extremely interesting and widespread cult of St. Martin: the association of special saints with countries, or baptistries, or hills, or, again, guilds or particular professions. The third section of the article is called "Les saintes dans la toponymie." "Il ne faut pas être grand clerc pour deviner que Saint-Quentin en France, le Saint-Gothard en Suisse, la gare de Saint-Pancras à Londres rappellent des souvenirs hagiographiques." Nowhere than in England is it more interesting to observe how place-names came from saint-names, very often quite unrecognized today.

This is a deplorably jejune reference to a most fascinating article. For the rest, we may note articles on The Georgian Passion of St. Michael, on the Dublin MS. of Vita S. Brendani, on a Constantinople Synod of 450, on the Life of Raimon Lull, and the usual complement of admirable reviews, among which is a valuable tribute to Professor C. C. J. Webb's edition of the *Metalogicon*.

W. H. H.

Prof. F. Heiler and the High-Church Union.

Prof. F. Heiler, editor of *Die Hochkirche*, discusses in two articles (January and February, 1930) the character and aims of the High-Church Union (*Die Hochkirchliche Vereinigung*). The first article is entitled "Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelical." Prof. Heiler wishes to emphasize the threefold character or ideal of the High-Church Union. They are orthodox, because they hold fast to the apostolic faith, and profess loyalty

also to the traditions of the ancient undivided Church, to its dogmatic decisions, its hierarchical orders, and its sacramental forms of life. They are catholic, because the Church of Christ is an indivisible whole, from which no part can be wilfully broken off without sin. They must therefore stand in living communion with the whole of œcumenical Christendom, the whole Church of the past and present. They are evangelical, because that means the real embodiment of the joyful message of the forgiving and saving grace of God. They must preserve the purity of the Gospel in the noble vessels in which their evangelical fathers have handed on this treasure: the Bible of Luther, the language of the people in Divine service, and Church hymns. Therefore they must live and strive for the threefold ideal of orthodox stability, catholic universality, and evangelical purity.

In the second article Prof. Heiler traces the history of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, and points out the change of emphasis from the legitimacy of ordination to the episcopal laying-on of hands as transmitting the apostolic powers. He admits that few of the Reformed Churches, except the Swedish and the Church of England, retained the episcopal order or constitution. As there is little prospect of the episcopal consecration of the evangelical district-bishops and general superintendents, the only course open for the High-Church Union is to strive for the incorporation into the apostolic succession. They must do so for three reasons: (1) The incorporation into the apostolic succession is the seal and completion of all their catholic exertions. (2) They must remove the offence, which they give to many brethren in the Orthodox, Roman and Anglican Church, that they celebrate the Eucharist and the other sacraments in the Catholic sense, without being empowered for this through fully Catholic consecration. (3) They all seek œcumenical fellowship both with the venerable Catholic churches of the East and with the Anglican Church, to which they stand so near.

The one thing possible for the High-Church Union is to organize a close brotherhood within the district churches. They may enter into the apostolic succession only under three conditions:

1. They must hold themselves free from every mechanical or legal conception. The incorporation into the apostolic succession may be only the symbol and pledge of something inward and spiritual—namely, the inward continuity with the Church of Christian antiquity. Without the inner catholicity, without the primitive Christian faith, prayer, and sacrifice, the apostolic succession is an empty husk.

2. They must beware of every kind of spiritual pride as regards other communions which have not obtained valid consecration.

3. They must leave room for the free working of the divine Spirit in those who are endowed with the immediate *charismata*. Venerable institutions of the ancient Church may only be renewed when at the same time the prophetic-spiritual element of primitive Christianity comes into its right again.

That Church alone is truly Catholic in which spirit and office, prophecy and episcopacy, charismatic *pneuma* and sacramental *opus operatum* stand in full harmony.

L. P.

REVIEW

THE MALINES ADVENTURE.

THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES, 1921-1925. Original Documents. Edited by Lord Halifax. Philip Allan and Co. 3s. 6d. net.

An adventure it was, and carried through, as an adventure should be, without official control. It is true that the leader was a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, but it was clearly understood that he was acting in no other capacity but that of a Christian man. He was careful, no doubt, to ascertain that his engagement in the adventure would not give mortal offence to his chief, and he had reason for thinking that it would be benignantly regarded. The other participants had less need of guarding their individuality. That is specially true of the original promoters. Lord Halifax could not be mistaken for anything but a pious layman; fantastic ignorance alone could imagine him to be an emissary of the Archbishop of Canterbury. M. Portal was a simple Lazarist priest, than which anything lower in the hierarchical scale it would be hard to find. Both were experienced adventurers, who had known failure and refused to be discouraged. Of the other partners, one or two were perhaps not wisely chosen. The work to be done was what is commonly described in books of adventure as "blazing a trail." Dr. Gore does not seem to be well fitted for a task demanding swift insight and adjustment. His special characteristic is a sort of massive imperturbability which would serve well for holding a fort. Mgr. Batiffol had been known for many years as a man whom—being a Frenchman—it is difficult to describe without the use of French adjectives. I resist the temptation. He was a competent scholar, a good historian, scrupulously truthful, but rather selective than prodigal of the truth; in short, a controversialist of high character who should have been able to contribute much, and did in fact contribute not a little, to the work proposed; but he had one serious defect as blazer of a trail. I am convinced that he did not believe in the existence of the goal. The rest were quite sure of that, and believed it to be attainable.

What does this belief involve? It involves, first, an assurance that something really exists, which may properly be called the Church of England. That was generally assumed in all the conversations. It involves the obvious existence of the Church of Rome, properly understood, not as a world-wide communion, but as a small and highly organized community having a local habitation. It involves, in the third place, a

recognition of the fact that the Church of England once stood in a close-knit filial relation to the Church of Rome, which ceased at a certain date but can be revived. This seems to have been accepted, perhaps with some reserve on the part of Mgr. Batiffol. It excludes the idea that these two Churches stand, so to say, in a sisterly relation to each other on terms of perfect equality. It may be doubted whether all the Anglican participants whole-heartedly renounced such a relation, but it is certain that all those engaged on the other side in the conversations would exclude it, and therefore it could form no part, even provisionally, of the basis of discussion. This should be borne in mind as marking a fundamental distinction between this friendly debate and the inconclusive controversies to which we have been accustomed for the last three hundred years. Controversy leads to nothing if matters reckoned of vital importance on one side or another are tacitly avoided. Much Anglo-Roman discussion is vitiated by this silence, and those who are aware of the defect are likely to be impatient of its futility. There are many to whom the Malines Conversations will seem futile for the same reason, but it is fair to suppose that the participants themselves, or most of them, were not keeping in reserve convictions which would reduce their ostensible labours to absurdity. To put the matter plainly, they must have been agreed that the Church of Rome may in some sense be rightly described as *mater et magistra omnium ecclesiarum*.

It cannot be denied that this fact robs the Conversations of all immediate practical importance, for there cannot be many in the Church of England who would assent to that description. But probably none of the participants expected to find any practical result within sight. That is not to say that their time was wasted. Even those futile controversies of which I have spoken, controversies in which opponents beat the air without getting into vital contact with each other, have made valuable contributions to the study of history. Even more may be expected when the object is to reach agreement, and not to win a dialectical victory. Such opponents or allies as Dr. Kidd and Mgr. Batiffol could hardly debate the subjects on which they were engaged at Malines without helping one another to elucidate some obscurities. An amusing illustration occurred when Dr. Kidd laboured to empty the *Decretum Gelasianum* of controversial value, and Mgr. Batiffol in reply airily threw the document overboard as a kind of Forged Decretal. I note, however, with regret a lingering tendency to use debated texts as if they were beyond question. Both Mgr. Batiffol and the Abbé Hemmer quoted St. Cyprian's words about the appeal of the Carthaginian dissidents, "ad

Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem," as if they were not probably—in view of the context and of his statements elsewhere—a sarcastic and contemptuous reference to the terms of the Letter of Appeal itself. Felicissimus may have been justified in the use of such language, and he does certainly seem to have been nearer than Cyprian to the main line of development, but it will not do to represent Cyprian as acknowledging in principle the propriety of his appeal. The mistake is the more remarkable since both the French scholars frankly acknowledge that Cyprian stood apart from the true line of development, while his correspondent Firmilian anticipated the fiercest of later Easterns in his treatment of the Roman See. But I am not one of the collocutors of Malines, and ought not to intervene in their discussion.

The outstanding product of the Conversations was unquestionably the anonymous memorandum read by the Cardinal on May 20, 1925. I do not mean that it is of outstanding importance, for it was but a fanciful dream of an actual realization of the hopes entertained, but it was the only concrete presentment of those hopes, and in reading it the Cardinal seemed to indicate that he thought those hopes not entirely illusory. A vision of "*l'Église anglicane unie non absorbée*" which involves the reversal of Pius IX.'s "*Papal Aggression*," and the summary extinction of the metropolitical see which Manning adorned, must indeed be called fanciful; but, after all, Pius VII. swept away a much more venerable hierarchy in France and the Netherlands in order to make peace with the Revolution. The interest of the memorandum was increased when it became known that the author was a member of the Benedictine community at Amay, to which the Pope had specially commended the study of all problems of reunion. His Holiness is now reported to have bidden the Fathers fix their attention exclusively on the East. There, also, they may perhaps prove excessively adventurous. One of them—English by birth—is said to have become a monk in the Russian Convent of Lake Ladoga. A departure from well-worn grooves of study often leads to disconcerting results.

T. A. LACEY.

NOTICES

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH, CHAPTERS I. TO XXXIX., IN THE LIGHT OF THE ASSYRIAN MONUMENTS. By Charles Boutflower. S.P.C.K., 1930.

"... Jews ask for signs, and Greeks seek after wisdom." In these words the great Apostle of the Gentiles summed up the two main types of mind with which he met. On the one hand stood those of his own

race, characteristically Oriental (though not confined to the East)—humble, dependent, unadventurous, looking for all they need to the generosity of its superiors, and seeking in religion above all things the manifestation of power. Such a mind must have revelation through miracle; and when faced by some event which it does not understand it says, "How wonderful! God must be here, since man could not have accomplished this." The other type, characteristically Western (though far from universal in the West), is philosophical, adventurous, scientific, trying as far as it may to attain its ends by its own efforts, and in religion satisfied by nothing but common sense. To such a mind God may be omnipotent, but must be self-consistent, and its reaction to "miracle" is, "I must understand how this is done, and see thus more of the ways and methods of God."

The two types of mind are with us still, and though it is as true as it was in St. Paul's day that neither can find ultimate satisfaction save in Christ crucified, yet the presentation, not only of that sublime fact, but also of man's preparation for it, must differ widely for the two classes. The Gospel must be preached in a language intelligible to its audience. Mr. Boutflower's work is addressed—and justifiably—to the "Jew." We felt this when he published *In and Around the Book of Daniel*, and while it was possible for the scientific student to recognize sympathetically the author's knowledge and, still more, his deep religious feeling, he would certainly not be convinced by the conjecture as to the identity of "Darius the Mede" or the elaborate reasoning on the Aramaic of the book. A comparison of Mr. Boutflower's work with that of Mr. H. H. Rowley will serve to illustrate this last point. Nevertheless, the book had its place, and we could not well have spared it—even if we disagreed with it.

The present volume is marked by many of the characteristics of the earlier work. Mr. Boutflower has spared no pains to collect all in the Mesopotamian records that may serve to illumine the first great section of the Book of Isaiah. He has made good use of the work of other scholars, both in the field of Assyriology and in that of Old Testament studies, though it is a little strange to find no reference to the *Cambridge Ancient History*—surely the most recent and the most scholarly presentation of the history of the age. He has brought to his task a great gift of imagination (indispensable in writing real history), though, if a criticism may be ventured, he seems at times to be thinking in terms of later ages rather than in the categories of the eighth century B.C. There are points, too, on which the opinion of an expert Assyriologist (one without a theological bias!) would be interesting. But doubts of this kind must not be allowed to detract from the merits of a very useful book which bears on every page the evidence of painstaking devotion to the elucidation of the subject.

Every right-minded reader of the new book will welcome one feature which offers a contrast to *In and Around the Book of Daniel*. Both works are frankly apologetic, but the later is far less obviously controversial than the earlier, and we gladly note the comparative absence of a somewhat sneering tone towards the "higher critic." Probably Mr. Boutflower has found that the higher critic agrees with him more nearly than he had supposed. Of course, he holds to his own convictions, and they are entitled to respect, but he must not be surprised or hurt if, for instance, he fails to win converts by his defence of the Isaianic authorship of chs. xxiv. to xxvii. But, when all is said, the book remains a useful col-

lection of material which will not fail to spread valuable knowledge among readers who entirely fail to appreciate the same facts if set forth by an adherent of the critical school. For this much thanks!

T. H. ROBINSON.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By O. A. Marti, Ph.D. Macmillan and Co. 10s. 6d.

A book which is in conception and execution new and welcome. As a specimen of the art of foreshortening history—a present necessity—it is a model. Professor Marti has a clear and important theme: that the Reformation in the English Church was no sudden product of the passion of Henry VIII. for Anne Boleyn, but the result of profounder forces long in maturing. “The roots of the Reformation reached deep down into a subsoil of money matters and of fundamental economic changes that were taking place.” If substantiated this is surely the way to capture attention both in the U.S.A. and in England, *economic* being at present a blessed word in both.

The author proves his theory by showing that the grandiose conception of the Papacy (to control all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them) made necessary a vast permanent revenue. Like many more mundane conquerors, the popes exhausted their credit to obtain the sinews of war.

Sufficient mention is made of France and other countries to show that the problem was not solely English, but the main narrative is English and developed from Henry III. to Henry VII. Such a treatment has the advantage that many allusions may be already familiar. And a wealth of racy contemporary evidence is available. All statements and quotations are documented, but too many are quoted from modern general histories.

The *Bibliography* looks like a section from the College Library catalogue (Medieval—England)

The drawbacks to a use of this book in English classrooms are two: the author's syncopated style and a crowd of small errors. If Professor Marti has adopted the German method of trusting pupils to write down his lectures, surely he should supervise the copy they provide for the press. “The king was permitted certain prohibited doctrines to be preached” (p. 202) suggests a strange papal indulgence, but probably read *permitting*. On p. 208 a greedy chaplain is said to intend soliciting a certain benefice “for the king” (*from*); Stubbs is made (but the reference could not be identified by this reviewer) to refer to an archbishop “Meneham”—read Peckham (p. 162). For “foreign detraction” (p. 137) read distraction. Latin passages quoted are rendered into English which occasionally offers new stumbling-blocks; on p. 178 Fisher is made to offer “Reginald Pole as the *regal prospect* about whom the reactionaries should rally,” but worst of all Wyclif is supposed to mention (p. 110) “hirelings of the ecclesiastics who *indignantly* held civil dominion.” If the American alumnus is as innocent of Latin as appears to be assumed he may fail to transpose to *indignus*. A statement on p. 162 that “an old manuscript” dates Ine's donation in Rome 882 illustrates doubly the Professor's carelessness: the reference is to Lagarde's *Latin Church in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1915), and though a confusion of Ine with Alfred may mean nothing in the U.S.A., it does here.

A. D. GREENWOOD.

OUR HEAVENLY FATHER. A Study of the Nature and Doctrine of God.
By Peter Green. Longmans. 4s.

This work is in the nature of a sequel to the author's previous volume, *Our Lord and Saviour*. The high level of Canon Peter Green's writings is well maintained in this latest effort to help to a more direct knowledge of God. Amidst much of a stimulating and helpful character we may note the author's verdict, after thirty years, during which the literature of the so-called conflict of religion and science has been his chief study, to the effect that he does not believe there is a word in modern science which need hinder any man from accepting the full Christian faith. We heartily endorse the Canon's conviction that we are on the threshold of a great era of constructive theological thinking comparable to the Alexandrine period of the second and third centuries, or the later scholastic period. We can warmly commend this study of the nature and doctrine of God to thoughtful laymen.

H. M. RELTON.

W. H. T. G. TO HIS FRIENDS. S.P.C.K. 5s.

This collection of some letters and informal writings of the late Canon Temple Gairdner of Cairo compiled by his wife will be warmly welcomed by all those who were privileged to call him friend or were influenced directly or indirectly by one of the most arresting and dynamic missionaries of our time. Gairdner was a remarkable personality, and something of the secret of his power is disclosed in these letters and informal papers which his many friends will be glad to have in book form as a memorial.

H. M. RELTON.

BEFORE WE MEET AT THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE. By the Right Rev. Neville S. Talbot, D.D., M.C., Bishop of Pretoria. Longmans. 2s.

LAUSANNE, LAMBETH, AND SOUTH INDIA. By N. P. Williams, D.D. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. Longmans. 5s. Paper cover, 3s. 6d.

These three small books form a natural group. Each writer has the coming Lambeth Conference directly or indirectly in mind, and each approaches the problem of Reunion from the standpoint of Anglican Catholicism. All would agree with Dr. Rawlinson's statement that "reunion, in any organic sense, does mean, in respect of the future, an agreed form of Church Order."

Bishop Neville Talbot is concerned to show that the attempt in theology to separate Christ from the Church is mistaken, and that what is needed is "a theology of the Church which is rooted and grounded in the mind of Christ." Such a doctrine he claims that the New Testament studied in a truly scientific spirit does provide.

From this interpretation of the mind of Christ he draws two conclusions: (1) "That the Catholic theology of the Church and Sacraments is inherently Christian and scriptural"; and (2) that "some of the divine wealth released in and through (Christ) is in the possession of the Protestant or Evangelical Churches." From these conclusions he infers that the well-being of the Church depends upon the healthy friction and tension between the priestly and prophetic elements in religion—in fact, that the

Church of the future must be built upon the "foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."

The only criticism that might be brought about this timely essay is that it belittles the movement in Protestant thought towards a doctrine of the Church.

Dr. Williams takes up the tale at the point at which the Bishop of Pretoria lays it down. His primary concern is with the doctrine of the ministry.

Dr. Williams is surely unanswerable when he argues that there must be a theory of the character and function of ministerial offices in the United Church (pp. 5, 6), for there cannot be one ministry universally acknowledged unless the most important offices in it are the same everywhere (p. 8). Reunion, however, "should not involve the acceptance of any particular theory of the origin of any office in the official ministry, *provided* that this is coupled with an affirmation of the Dominical origin of that ministry as a whole, and of its continuous identity, preserved by the chain of sacramental ordination, with the Apostolic ministry" (p. 19).

Like Bishop Talbot, Dr. Williams recognizes Apostolic and Prophetic ministries as both necessary, though his explanation of the distinction is questionable and vitiates his subsequent argument. Starting from a saying of Dr. Du Bose that the Word is the principle and medium of objective revelation, and the Spirit is that of subjective apprehension, comprehension, and appropriation, he suggests that the twofold ministry, apostolic and prophetic, is congruous with this twofold method of God's approach to men, "one branch of it objective, orderly, institutional, tracing its being and authority to acts of the Incarnate Word, performed by His human hands and lips in space and time—the other irregular, sporadic, incalculable, vouched for by none except interior and subjective guarantees, raised up to meet particular emergencies or situations of the viewless energies of the Spirit, 'dividing to each one severally even as He will.'" That there is truth in this distinction none would deny, but it seems to fall short of the whole truth. Apostolicity applied to the ministry implies "sentness" and "authority," both derived from Christ. But surely the Holy Spirit is sent and with authority which is precisely that of Christ, and prophetic ministries can rightly claim a share in this sentness and authority derived from the Spirit. *Per contra* Christ is as wholly Prophetic as the Spirit. The distinction between the two types of ministry cannot be described by resort to the elusive terms "objective" and "subjective."

The defect of Dr. Williams' argument at this point makes his plan, that reunion should be effected by inviting "prophetic" ministers to accept another kind of ministry, the apostolic, seem a little unreal. It is hard to imagine Nonconformist ministers accepting the plan, for they would not accept the distinction on which Dr. Williams bases it.

In discussing the real difficulties which attend the South India scheme Dr. Williams seems at times to let his capacity for incisive logic run away with him. A world-wide, all-embracing, simultaneous scheme of union is hardly within the sphere of practical policy. Two other avenues are thus open. One is a preparatory fusion of each of the great families of denominations, such as is outlined on pp. 54-56 of the book before us. The difficulties here seem manifold. Sentiment apart, it is really questionable whether the *ethos* of Anglicanism is more akin to that of the Orthodox Churches than, let us say, to Scottish Presbyterianism. Moreover, the Protestant

denominations are rapidly losing their denominational loyalties and acquiring a sense of Churchhood which will not be satisfied with denominational groupings. Again, greater than any existing denominational cleavages is the cleavage between the modern and the fundamentalist outlook. The other possible avenue to reunion is a local scheme, and a local scheme is bound to produce awkward anomalies which can be ridiculed on paper, but must be accepted in life with faith and courage, as part of the discipline involved in a movement towards better things.

Dr. Rawlinson's exposition of the New Testament doctrine of the Church is closely in line with that of the Bishop of Pretoria. His discussions of the visible and invisible Church and of the nature of schism are excellent.

He passes from the New Testament to a discussion of *Ecclesia Anglicana* since the Reformation. It is a fair and straightforward historical statement and gives the impression, surely a true one, that Anglicanism is still in its early days and has a great future before it.

Spiritual liberty for the provinces of Canterbury and York has still to be won, and the spirit of partizanship and clerical autocracy to be exorcised. Yet if she will rise to her opportunity in the modern world the Anglican Church, inasmuch as she has affinities with all of the four main confessional types of Christianity—Latin, Orthodox, Lutheran, and Calvinistic—has it in her to play the part of mediator.

E. R. MORGAN.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By C. P. S. Clarke.
Longmans, Green and Co. 10s. 6d.

To give a history of the Church in 500 pages is no mean feat. Such summaries may be dreary indeed, as the writer remembers in the case of Kurtz. But dreariness would certainly not come from Canon Clarke, whose book *From Nero to Constantine* tells the story so refreshingly. Here he sets out to clothe the dry bones with an integument of flesh and skin, and he has certainly done so. But he acknowledges that copiousness in one direction makes a need of compression or omission in others, and there are places where one regrets the compression. This is seen in the section on the Eastern Church after Chalcedon, and among the pioneers in our own Church it is strange to find Aldhelm receiving much fuller attention than Theodore, and Grosseteste only appearing in a paragraph on Patronage.

In the post-Reformation period, some economy might have been effected by confining the record to the parts of Christendom which remained within the Church by the retention of episcopacy. It is inevitable that, if the book advances by periods, there must be rapid transitions from one part of the Church to another. But sometimes this method is used with great effect. For instance, the paragraph on Anselm and William II. is not immediately succeeded by one on Henry II. and Becket, but the struggle between Pope Hadrian IV. and the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa is wedged between them. The reader is left to find a connexion for himself, but he is given the realization of a wider rivalry between Church and Crown than that suggested by English history. A fuller correlation of kindred facts and tendencies in various countries would have been of great value.

In order to make the history interesting, it has largely been given

from the point of view of persons. But the result is sometimes the mention of a bewildering number of names, whereas the account of movements rather than men might have been more useful historically. The writing of history, particularly on the grand side, raises the problem whether it is to centre in men or movements. It is the tracing of tendencies, and the illustrating of them by the work of individuals, which may give the best "history of the Church." But if the book is rather lacking in this respect (though only in some places), and the reading of it may prove—as in the case of the old lady and the dictionary—"very interesting but somewhat disjointed," such things are bound to occur when so big a task is attempted. The author is to be congratulated for his facing of it, and for his success in producing so readable a summary.

T. W. CRAFER.

SAINT BENEDICT AND THE SIXTH CENTURY. By Dom John Chapman.
London: Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

The English Benedictines of our day are famous for their learning, and it would be strange if much of their time and their ability were not turned to the study of their own great system. We are accustomed to listen to Dom Cuthbert Butler, whenever their principles are to be expounded; but here is Dom Chapman devoting himself to origins; and sometimes, of course quite gently, and as brothers should, clashing with his learned *commonachus*.

In a way, Dom Chapman has chosen the harder and the more thankless part, though his enthusiasm is such that he delights in disposing of difficulties and is generally grateful for feeling able to prove anything. Let any student who is accustomed to calendar ascertainable events start here on Chapter VIII., called "The Date of St. Benedict," and ask himself in all sympathy what it feels like to begin with a statement, true, of course, beyond all question, that the traditional dates for the great founder's life are not historical, but "partly conjectural, partly dependent on forgeries." There are, no doubt, the data provided by the Dialogues of St. Gregory, and Dom Chapman cleverly brings together a certain amount of what he himself calls "vague evidence." Roughly, what he contends for is that we must push back the date of the publication of the Rule by about four years, say to A.D. 526, and we must add ten or eleven years to the saint's traditional span of life.

A good deal depends on Dom Chapman's interesting and courageous effort to establish the fact that Justinian's Code shows a knowledge of the Rule. Such an enterprise needs caution; it is specially requisite not to use modern terms about the issuing of books nor to say that Justinian "was extremely likely to make himself acquainted with the new Rule lately published near Rome itself as a norm for the West by the great Thaumaturgus of the day"; for that sentence contains three interesting, possible, but quite unproved assumptions, more suited to an age of "best-sellers" and "broadcast."

Amid all this uncertainty the Rule itself is sure, and its text has been established with as much care and skill as if it were a Gospel or the *Æneid*. Indeed, it is a little tragic that, in the very year in which the Benedictine presidents espoused the great principle of "*conversio morum*," Dom Butler should have proved in the *Journal of Theological Studies* that the true text is "*conversatio morum*." Of course, Dom Chapman accepts this

reading, but he proceeds to "go one better" than his learned brother and to contend that in St. Benedict's time "conversatio" had become by itself a synonym for monastic observance or "Religion." It is all very interesting, if a little rash.

ERNEST WORCESTER.

GESCHICHTE DER OFFENBARUNG DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS. By Dr. Franz Feldmann. Bonn: Peter Hanstein. Third edition. 1930. M. 9.60. In paper covers, M. 7.60.

This book, which bears an archiepiscopal imprimatur, is a history of Israel, viewed from the standpoint of politics and of religion. The author shows himself to be a devout and open-minded Roman Catholic, of wide knowledge and high scholarly attainments, and these features give the volume a peculiar interest.

In the earlier portions, Dr. Feldmann gives us little more than a summary of the Biblical narrative in his own words, usually with an appended note on the historicity and the religious value of the section with which he has just been dealing. As he progresses, he adheres less closely to the text of the O.T., the data supplied by archæological research are freely employed, and in the last part of the book—that which deals with the second half of the monarchy—the tone and outlook are hardly to be distinguished from those of the normal Protestant scholar.

The author's attitude to critical questions is particularly interesting. While he is well acquainted with the critical work of the last fifty years, he does not commit himself formally either to the acceptance or to the rejection of the modern position. His tendencies are, of course, conservative, but there are traces of the effect that recent studies have had upon his mind. In telling the story of the crossing of the Red Sea, for instance, he makes no mention of those miraculous features which mark the P form of the narrative, but confines himself to the older record. Though, naturally, Dr. Feldmann often finds himself compelled to differ from other scholars, his language is always moderate, never abusive, and he shows no sign of the bitterness which too often mars the work of the professional controversialist.

It remains to add that the book is written in a simple, straightforward style, with short and clear sentences, making its perusal a pleasure, even for a reader imperfectly acquainted with German.

T. H. ROBINSON.

BOOK NOTES

The Inward Vision. By R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. Longmans. 5s. "One may hold a truth, yet without inwardly possessing it." In these words from the preface Fr. Steuart gives the keynote of a singularly beautiful and spiritual book, sane, vivid, and simple; the very opposite of "jesuitical." The author treats dogmatic formulæ as symbols which are intended to lead us from "outward sense" to "inward vision," yet they remain the only possible expression of that which the inward vision has described.

The Way of Conversion. By Paul B. Bull, M.A., C.R. Being Mission Sermons and Instructions for Home Reading. Faith Press. Cloth, 3s. Paper, 2s. Fr. Bull has here set out at length the whole course of teaching

and preaching which makes up the first week of a mission. It may be hoped that he will find it possible, as he suggests in the preface, to supplement this volume by the exercises of an equally full transcript of the second week. There is a misprint, "now" for "not," on p. 152.

Instructions on the Atonement. By the same Author. Cloth, 2s. 6d. Paper, 1s. 6d. A reprint of a course of sermons delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral in 1914.

From Chaos to God: Religion and Renewal. By Frederick B. Macnutt, M.A. Provost of Leicester Cathedral and Archdeacon of Leicester. James Clark and Co. 6s. This collection includes two really splendid and moving sermons, *The Way to the Heart of God*, and *The Moral Equivalent of War*. The remainder are good sermons, no doubt, but what is admirably suited to a cathedral pulpit at a Nave Service does not necessarily appear to the fullest advantage when aligned with its fellows in a formation so unnatural.

The Purpose of Jesus in the First Three Gospels. By Campbell N. Moody, D.D. Bruce Lectures. 1929. George Allen and Unwin. 5s. A fresh but elusive treatment of a great subject. Dr. Moody is concerned to point out, in contradiction to much loose talk, that our Lord in His own Person is really the central Object of the Synoptic Gospels. He is more prone to speak of attachment to Himself than of submission to the will of God. Essentially it is faith in Himself that He demands, but the demand for repentance is even more conspicuous than that for faith. Very little can really be known of His general public preaching; His recorded utterances with their tremendous demands are for the most part addressed to the inner circle of *disciples*. But in the end these same disciples find that the standard is not really impossible. The gift of the indwelling Christ, attested by the Eucharist, transforms the sternness of the Gospels into the joy which characterizes the Epistles.

K. D. M.

INDEX OF VOLUME XX

JANUARY—JUNE, 1930

	PAGE
Anglican Bishops in India, Three Questions from the	303
Apostolic Succession: Bishop Stubbs	153
BINNS, E. ELLIOTT	48
Birkbeck Lectures	155
BIRMINGHAM, Bishop of	216
Books Reviewed:	
Adventure of Prayer, The. By Father Andrew	297
An die Römer. By H. Lietzmann	299
Anfänge reformatorische Bibelauslegung. Edited by J. Ficker	55
Archbishop Parker's Register, Part LXXXIII.	176
Authority of Christian Experience, The. By R. H. Strachan	240
Bishop's Register, The. By C. J. Offer	113
Book of Essays: "The Thing." By G. K. C.	235
Book of Isaiah, I-XXXIX. By C. Boutflower	351
Brief Sketch of the Church of England. By G. K. A. Bell	120
Case for Episcopacy, The. By K. D. Mackenzie	162
Catholicism and Christianity. By C. J. Cadoux	108
Christian Ideas in History. By C. E. Osborne	116
Christian Religious Experience. By Bishop Chandler	106
Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light. By F. J. Hall	162
Christ Jésus, Le. By M. Lepin	114
Church Union in South India. By Bishop E. H. M. Waller	162
Decline of the West, The. By O. Spengler	117
Disestablishment. By the Bishop of Durham	47
Dogma in History and Thought. Various	232
Doubts and Difficulties. By C. A. Alington	175
Economic Causes of the Reformation. By O. A. Marti	352
Epistle to the Ephesians. By W. Lock	237
Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Christian Faith. By J. M. Shaw	171
Fellowship Principles and Practice. By a Fellowship Group	239
Fourth Gospel, Commentary on. By Archbishop Bernard	165
Great Britain and Slave Trade. By W. L. Mathieson	296
Has the Church Failed? By K. Ingram	120
History of the People of England. By A. D. Greenwood	112
Humanism and Christianity. By Bishop McConnell	177
Hymns of the Alvares. By J. S. M. Hooper	175
Idealism of Christian Ethics, The. By G. Walker	298
Institutiones Biblicæ, Vol. II., Part III. By A. Vacari	119
Introduction to History of Mysticism. By M. Smith	297
Jesus-Jeshua. By G. Dalman	52
Letters to a Doubter. By Paul Claudel	173
Luther and the Reformation (Vol. III.). By J. Mackinnon	48
Magic and Grace. By Lindsay Dewar	236
Malines, The Conversations at. By Lord Halifax	348
Masterful Monk, The. By O. F. Dudley	172
Mediaeval Inquisition, The. By J. Guiraud	177
New Testament Problems. By W. K. Lowther Clarke	105
Occasional Prayers in 1928 Book. By E. Milner-White	97
Orthodox Religion in the Light of Today. By E. H. Archer-Shepherd	171
Our Heavenly Father. By Peter Green	353
Our Present Philosophy of Life. By Montgomery Belgion	293
Padre in Paraguay. By C. E. Newbould	230
Pascal's Philosophy of Religion. By C. J. Webb	112
Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity. By J. Baillie	299
Plain Tales from Flanders. By P. B. Clayton	117
Prayer in Modern Life. By F. Underhill	296
Problems of Providence. By C. J. Shebbeare	106
Reformation and the People, The. By T. A. Lacey	106
Religious Quests of the Græco-Roman World. By S. Angus	238
Renewal of Life in the Clergy. By D. Jenks	175
Resurrection of the Dead, The. By F. S. M. Bennett	177
Rolle and "Our Daily Work." By Geraldine Hodgson	171
St. Benedict and the Sixth Century. By Dom J. Chapman	356
St. Gregory the Great. By Pierre Batiffol	173
Short History of the Christian Church. By C. P. S. Clarke	355

Books Reviewed (*continued*):

	PAGE
Sibyls and Seers. By Edwyn Bevan.	58
Summa Contra Gentiles of St. Thomas Aquinas	56
Twenty-Five Years in South America. By Bishop Every	230
Who moved the Stone? By F. Morison	290
Woman of Andros, The. By Thornton Wilder	299
CANNON, W. W.	184, 249
CLARKE, W. K. L.	43, 222
Confirmation and South India	28, 71
Confirmation, Note on	76
Contra Celsum	197
DARBYSHIRE, J. R.	230
DEWAR, LINDSAY	90, 123
Doctrine of Election, The	101
DU BUISSON, Dean	141
DUNKLEY, E. H.	278
Eighteenth-century Sunday School	227
Evangelical Conception of Sacraments	207
Four New Prayer Books	141
Fourth Gospel: Its Author	262
HARDY, T. J.	83
HARTON, F. P.	130
Historic Episcopate, Meaning of the	313
HUDSON, C. E.	106
HUTTON, Dean	21
"Infallibility" and "Indefectibility"	157
Israel and Moab	184, 249
Jewish Christianity	4
Johannine Gnosis, Significance of	328
KENNETT, R. H.	52
KNOX, W. L.	108
Lambeth Agenda, The	241
Letters on Missions in India	21
MACKENZIE, K. D.	232
McKERROW, J. C.	197
McNEILE, A. H.	14
MARSHALL, H. S.	101
Mental Prayer	130
Mind and the Heart, The	90, 123
Miscellanea	41, 97, 153, 221, 283, 339
MORRIS, Prof.	28, 71
MOSS, C. B.	303
Neglected Mandate, The	83
NOLLOTH, C. F.	262
NUNN, H. P. V.	114, 221
PALMER, H. P.	320
Pekin Man and Immortality	216
Periodicals, Notes on	41, 99, 285, 345
PLYMOUTH, Bishop of	47
POPE, R. MARTIN	328
Protestation of 1789, The	278
QUICK, O. C.	271
Reunion	14
RIGG, W. H.	98
Sacramental Theory	271
SELWYN, A. B.	227
SELWYN, E. G.	1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 293, 301
SHEBBEARE, C. J.	207
SMYTH, C. H.	155
Studies in Texts	43, 98, 228
Te Deum, Notes on	44
TURNER, Prof.	4
Wheatley on the B.C.P.	222
WHITNEY, J. P.	153, 313
William Somerton, Prior of Bynham	320
WILLIAMS, N. P.	76
WOOD, H. G.	293

